OUR RURAL HERITAGE

JOHN MICKEL WILLIAMS

Library
OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY

Regulations

1. Books may be borrowed for a period of two weeks.
2. At the expiration of two weeks books may be re-let if returned to the librarian in good condition.
3. A rental of two cents a day will be charged on each book held over two weeks.

Class No. 323.3 Accession No. 26064

Heterick Memorial Library
Ohio Northern University
Ada, Ohio 45810

OUR RURAL HERITAGE

SOME BORZOI TEXTS

AN INTRODUCTION TO MODERN SOCIAL PROBLEMS
Philip A. Parsons

THE FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
by James Mickel Williams

PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
by James Mickel Williams

OUR GOVERNMENTAL MACHINE
Schuyler C. Wallace

PRINCIPLES OF PSYCHOLOGY
J. Robert Kantor

THE TREND OF ECONOMICS
by Various Writers

PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMICS
Raymond T. Bye

OUR RURAL HERITAGE

The Social Psychology of Rural Development

BY

JAMES MICKEL WILLIAMS, B.D., PH.D.

New York ALFRED·A·KNOPF *Mcmxxv*

OHIO WESLEYAN LIBRARY UNIVERSITY

COPYRIGHT, 1925, BY ALFRED A. KNOPF, INC. · PUBLISHED, 1925 · SET UP, ELECTROTYPED AND PRINTED BY THE VAIL-BALLOU PRESS, BINGHAMTON, N. Y. · PAPER MANUFACTURED BY DILL & COLLINS COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA, PA., AND FURNISHED BY MARQUARD, BLAKE & DECKER, NEW YORK · BOUND BY THE H. WOLFF ESTATE, NEW YORK. ·

630.1
W72
cop. 4

A NOTE ON THE TYPE IN WHICH THIS BOOK IS SET

The type in which this book has been set (on the Linotype) is Old Style No. 1. In design, the face is of English origin, by MacKellar, Smith and Jordan, and bears the workmanlike quality and freedom from "frills" characteristic of English old styles in the period prior to the introduction of the "modern" letter. It gives an evenly textured page that may be read with a minimum of fatigue. Old Style No. 1 was one of the first faces designed and cut by the Linotype Company, and it is still one of the most popular.

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

23.3
72

TO

MY DEAR FATHER

RILEY WALTER WILLIAMS

WHOSE LOVE, PATIENCE, AND UNDERSTANDING
HAVE STRENGTHENED ME THROUGH THE YEARS
AND WHO HAS MADE POSSIBLE THIS RESEARCH

26064

CONTENTS

	Preface	ix
	Introduction	xiii
I	Rural Development	1
II	The Methods of Rural Social Psychology	9
III	The Neighbourhood and the Community	19
IV	Physical Environment and Psychological Processes	25
V	Attitudes to the Weather and the Moon	32
VI	Traditional Family Attitudes	46
VII	The New Conditions	50
VIII	The Relations Between the Sexes	56
IX	The Relations of Parents and Children	65
X	Relations of Kinship	78
XI	Economic Attitudes	81
XII	Attitudes of Business and Professional Men	103
XIII	Attitudes of Social Intercourse	111
XIV	The Humorous Attitude	121
XV	Attitudes of Institutional Religion	128
XVI	Attitudes of Personal Religion	151
XVII	Attitudes of Public Education	154
XVIII	Intellectual Attitudes	159
XIX	Juristic Attitudes	174
XX	Political Attitudes	185
XXI	Reflections on Early Rural Life; Adherence to Custom	192
XXII	Society and the Individual	201
XXIII	Social Consciousness and Conflict	210
XXIV	Economic Interpretations	221
XXV	Our Rural Heritage and the National Life	228

PREFACE

Social psychology is now an accredited science. Time was when social scientists gave it the cold shoulder but its importance as a unifying science has been discerned. Psychologists have ceased to have to do merely with the individual in the laboratory and are studying the individual in his group relations. Ethnologists no longer look askance at psychological interpretations of primitive culture but are aiming to discover the essential tendencies of the behaviour of primitive man. Students of modern society have centred on the psychological processes of family relations, industrial relations, politics, professional and ecclesiastical relations and public education. The methods used have differed, owing to differences in viewpoint and to the inevitable uncertainties of a new field, but there is an agreement in the emphasis on observation and analysis of the facts of behaviour at first hand as a starting point. The contributions already made disclose some agreement on essential processes, though with a diversity in terminology.

It is doubtless true that social groups with a simple organization, in which behaviour presents the form of a series of closely related adaptive complexes, are the most favourable fields in which to begin the study of social psychology. Primitive and rural groups for this reason especially attract the social psychologist. On the other hand, the essential processes are seen in society at all stages of complexity, and the complex helps to explain the simple, as well as the simple the complex. This book and the one that will follow are studies both of a simple and of a complex society. They depict the development of a rural population from its simple organization as isolated neighbourhoods of equals to its present complex organization as an advanced agricultural population.

This book is one of the inductive studies referred to in the preface to my *Foundations of Social Science*. It offers an analysis of the attitudes and beliefs that enter into our rural heritage. This is a psychological study and I treat only that part of the rural heritage that is susceptible of psychological analysis. This book will be

followed by one on the expansion of rural life, which will show the rural heritage in process of adaptation to new conditions. The two books depict one great process of social development and I shall occasionally refer to them together as "this work." The last chapters of this book suggest psychological points of view for an interpretation of rural life but are not intended as a systematic interpretation. These books are concrete, descriptive, analytical.

Our rural heritage is by no means a subject of merely historical interest. It is a living thing to-day. Modified by the unprecedented changes of the past fifty years it still is the psychological basis of rural civilization, and, as such, constitutes a good part of the psychological basis of our national life. A study of it is, therefore, of great practical importance, as well as of scientific interest.

In these books I amplify the treatment of the field of social psychology begun in previous books. Rural social psychology logically comes first in a survey of social psychology. For the study of custom logically precedes the study of variations from custom, and rural life is particularly favourable for the study of the psychology of custom. Furthermore, the study of the psychology of agricultural organization logically precedes that of industry, business and the professions. For agriculture was once the prevailing occupation and rural attitudes have affected business, industrial and professional behaviour to such an extent that we need to delineate the attitudes and beliefs of the rural population as a preparation for the study of business, industry and the professions. This book, therefore, logically precedes my *Foundations of Social Science* and my *Principles of Social Psychology*. It should be useful not only to those who teach the social sciences but also to teachers of history who wish to give their students some insight into the processes of history.

This is a book for students and for the general reader. A previous knowledge of social psychology is not necessary in order to understand it. To assist the reader who would follow out lines of thought of the text, I have given citations to works on social psychology and rural life. These are given, not to lend authority to the text but to assist critical study.

In preparing this book I have had the assistance of my parents and grandparents and of others in those generations, also of many people in my own, particularly of Professor Harry P. Coats of the College of the City of New York, who read parts of the manuscript and made many helpful suggestions. For assistance in the proof reading

I am indebted to Mr. Roy H. Ellinghouse, Instructor in History in Hobart College, Mr. Chauncey M. Louttit of Hobart College and Miss Emma M. Tower of William Smith College.

JAMES M. WILLIAMS

Geneva, N. Y. Sept. 24, 1924.

INTRODUCTION

A famous teacher, when a student came to him with an idea, is said to have asked three questions: "What is your idea?" "What are your reasons for it?" "What of it?" These questions I think a reader has a right to ask of an author. Though this work is primarily descriptive and analytical, I propose here to give the reader some hints that will serve in interpreting the facts and analyses presented.

What is the purpose of this work? So far as I know it is the first attempt that has been made to explain historically the attitudes and beliefs of a considerable part of the rural population of the United States. The usual historical material has to do with outstanding events, political parties, policies of government; it is the material that is found most abundantly in the documentary sources. Yet historians fall back on "public opinion" for explanations of their material, without explaining how public opinion explains it. This work aims to dissect various elements that have entered into the public opinion of the rural population of New York State. The elements will not be found to be essentially different in Illinois, Iowa or Minnesota, for the attitudes and beliefs of New York were carried to those and other western states, and the history of New York was there lived over again.

Our method of treatment is that of a cross sectional description of attitudes and beliefs in three successive periods. It is in a sense, therefore, historical. But the description is not made to centre around particular historical events, as the anti-masonic crusade or the slavery controversy. That is, accredited historical events are not taken as points of departure, for the attitudes and beliefs of a population are a continuing force and what we call historical events are, in part, these attitudes and beliefs attaining an emotional intensity under stress of some crisis, and effectuating significant group action. So the point of approach is from the continuing forces, not the events.

It is evident, then, why this work is entitled *The Social Psychology of Rural Development.* It is primarily a psychological study. There are other aspects of rural development than the psychological, but we are concerned with the psychological processes of development.

To understand these, as will be shown in Chapters I and II, requires methods different from those required for a study of the history of agriculture and of the external aspects of institutions. To be sure one cannot understand all the causes of changes in agriculture and institutions without knowing the psychological processes; and, conversely, one method of getting at the psychological processes is to study changes in agriculture and institutions and see what these imply as to changes in the underlying psychological processes. We are concerned with changes in agriculture and institutions only to that extent.

So much for the idea of the work. How well it is carried out must not be judged without due consideration of the nature and difficulty of the task. It involves the study of a large body of sources of which but a fraction have been thoroughly gone over. A thorough research of all the sources is beyond the power of one person. Consequently further study will amplify and correct what has been done.

Perhaps I should say something of the significance of the idea of the work before going on to the question, "What of it?" The conception of the attitudes and beliefs of the common man as social forces in history does not by any means contradict a proper emphasis on the compelling rôle of special interests. It has elsewhere been shown that politics "is essentially a rivalry of economic classes and interests which support political parties for the sake of protecting or advancing their interests, and of party organizations the essential aim of which is to defeat the other party and 'keep in power' or 'get back to power'. . . . Legislators in a democracy are elected by a majority or plurality of voters, but" may fall under the control of special interests that constitute a very small minority.[1] These special interests are represented both by men in public office and by private citizens and their activities constitute an essential process of government. They include not only business interests but farmers' and labour organizations. The unorganized individual has little or no political influence. He gets influence by coming to represent some interest. The opinion that officials listen to is the opinion of special interests. Every organized interest wants legislation of a more or less technical kind and the expert representatives of an interest are those to whose opinions legislators give attention. However, while the public opinion that counts is the complex and often conflicting opinion of special interests, at the same time important political problems are constantly arising that involve a consideration of "what the people will think." How will they take the leasing of certain natural re-

sources to certain special interests? How will they take the issuing of an injunction against a great labour organization? Consequently the executive of a calibre large enough to hold his political position for any length of time cannot let himself be carried away by the opinions of well organized and vociferous interests to the neglect of the ordinarily inaudible reactions of the unorganized masses. The great executive has an ear for the inaudible. He has a profound insight into the attitudes of the people, and his own attitude is that of an exponent of those desires of the people that the general well being requires should be satisfied. Thus, the proper emphasis on the rôle of special interests and of the great man in history is not by any means contrary to an emphasis also on the rôle of the people. So we come back to the need of understanding their attitudes and beliefs.

Unorganized, however, people seem incapable of progress. The decisive force in rural development has been leadership, including that of inventors, of research workers in and out of institutions, of teachers of agriculture, of certain rural magazines, of organizers of the farmers, and last but not least of the farmers of unusual mental initiative scattered throughout the rural communities, who have stood for agricultural progress among a people more or less given to pessimism because of the hardships and disappointments of the farmer's life. To these various forms of leadership are due: (1) the invention of farm tools and machinery; (2) the long history of improvements of farm crops and farm animals by plant and animal breeders; (3) the improvement of agricultural methods by research workers; (4) the improvement of methods of conveying this information to the individual farmer; (5) the organization of farmers for co-operative buying, co-operative marketing and co-operative political action. Progress in the fourth and fifth points has been greater in the past ten years than in the entire preceding period, but the failures of the preceding years prepared the farmers, and the accumulated experience taught the leaders the lessons necessary for the epoch-making organization of the past ten years.

We come now to the third question raised with reference to the idea of the work, "What of it?" This may mean, what is the significance of the work for sociological theory, or what truths of practical importance has the research revealed. As to its significance for sociological theory it should be another link in the chain of proof of the truth of the economic interpretation of society.[2] According to this theory, material conditions and interests are essential in social

change. This idea is not new to the farmer. The question of dollars and cents is apt to be prominent in connection with any proposed change. And changes unconsciously made, unconscious changes in attitudes and beliefs, are no less subject to material conditions. This work could have been written from a theoretical point of view, that is, first stating the theory and then making a judicious selection of facts in support of it, but I preferred to make the presentation descriptive and analytical, as my method of study has been inductive, and to indicate the fundamental functioning of the economic attitudes at various points and leave the reader to interpret the significance of this for an economic interpretation of rural development. The suggestion of an economic interpretation arouses resistance at the start but, after all, that is not a bad way to begin the reading of a book. For the essential thing is to get something beside the mere facts. And it is better for the reader to try to see the animal in the picture of rural life I shall give than for me to draw the animal. Let each chapter, then, be a problem in interpretation.

We turn now to the second aspect of the question, "What of it?" What truths of practical importance has this research revealed? It is best to leave the reader to gather these from the text, because truths of importance from his or her point of view might escape me and truths important from my point of view would involve repeating a good deal of the text. But a word may be said about the practical importance of rural social psychology in general. There is now taking place in Europe and America the most widespread and well organized agrarian movement in history. It is not that rural populations are worse off than they have been. It is due to the fact that their communities are no longer isolated and they have been brought into intimate contact with classes which have been becoming more rapidly prosperous than the farmer. Furthermore, within the rural community some families have become more prosperous than others. As long as all were equally poor, no one was bothered by his poverty. Inequality causes discontent. Also, in America and in certain European nations the old-time neighbourliness and sense of solidarity of the rural community is on the wane and the farmer is thrown back on himself. Rural life does not give the contentment it once gave. The farmer is less absorbed in the mere process of work, in mere industriousness, and has become intent on the financial results of work. Hence the movement on the part of rural populations to improve their economic condition. The means employed are economic

reorganization and the use of political power. Both in European nations and in the United States the tillers of the soil have become a political force whose demands for justice must be satisfied before there is economic or political stability. Consequently an understanding of the situation in the various nations—a world view of present civilization—requires an understanding of rural social psychology.

CHAPTER I

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

RURAL social psychology is the psychology of people living in rural hamlets or in the open country. In America most farmers live in the open country, while in Europe and Asia they live more largely in hamlets. For this and other reasons the psychology of European peasants will differ somewhat from that of American farmers. In America the village is the trading and social centre of the farming community round about and, because of this intimate relation between the village and the rural parts, a study of rural psychology unavoidably includes a study of the psychology of the village.

The importance of rural social psychology becomes evident when we consider that a considerable part of the population of most of the great nations is rural. The meaning given the word rural by census-takers differs in the great nations. The United States census defines urban population as that residing in cities and other incorporated places having 2,500 inhabitants and over; the remainder is rural. On this basis the percentage of the total population of the United States which was rural in 1880 was 71.4; in 1890, 64.6; in 1900, 60; in 1910, 54.2; in 1920, 48.6. But this rural population so-called included mill villages and mining villages under 2500. In the census of 1920 an enumeration was made of the population living on farms and it constituted 29.9 per cent of the total population.[1] In England and Wales about 3.2 per cent live by agriculture and fishing; in Ireland about 63 per cent by agriculture; in Germany about 15.4 per cent by agriculture and forestry; in France about 21.5 per cent by agriculture; in Denmark about 30.4 per cent by agriculture, forestry and fishing; in Sweden about 46.9 per cent by agriculture, forestry and fishing; in Poland about 65.5 per cent by agriculture; in European Russia over 84 per cent by agriculture; in Japan 70 per cent by agriculture; and in India 72 per cent.[2] One reason for the importance of the subject of rural psychology is, therefore, the numbers and wide distribution of the rural population. Fifteen years ago President Butterfield emphasized

the practical value of a knowledge of social psychology for the rural population itself;[8] since then the science has developed and its importance has increased.

Rural social psychology is important also because the psychology of business, industry, and the professions cannot be understood without knowing rural psychology. Less than a hundred years ago the industries of the United States were largely in the rural neighbourhoods and villages. So were a large proportion of the business and professional men. These men had rural attitudes, which have persisted in industry, business and the professions to this day. To-day many of these classes still live in the rural districts. A considerable proportion of the children in the public schools of the nation live on farms. These children grow up with the rural attitudes. A part of them continue to live in the rural districts but a considerable part become business and professional men and manual workers in the cities. They carry to the cities the rural attitudes. Wherefore, the psychology of the city cannot be understood without knowing that of the country.

A knowledge of the social psychology of rural development is important because of the tendency of people who have the guidance of rural affairs to reason by historical analogies without regard to changes in psychological conditions in different periods of history. While it is well to be mindful of what has taken place in the past, in the formulation of policies for the present and future, the past cannot be understood without a knowledge of the psychological conditions of the past as compared with those of the present. Without this understanding, a use of the past to interpret the future is apt to be more or less superficial analogy.

An analysis of the social psychology of rural development should not be confined to one nation. However, the data are very meagre, even for the United States. The source books on rural sociology contain scarcely anything on rural social psychology, and, with the exception of Thomas and Znaniecki's great work, monographic studies of rural communities are almost wholly concerned with external aspects of social organization. Wherefore the time for a thoroughgoing treatise on the psychology of rural development is not yet. This work is merely a suggestion of its possibility. What is needed are psychological studies of typical communities all over the world to serve as the basis for such a work.

In the making of such studies it would be well to have in mind some theory of development. Such a theory will at first touch only

the most general aspects. For the developments of different nations differ in important respects. For instance, European observers have noted that the American farmer differs from the European in being more individualistic and enterprising.[4] In Europe and Asia the farmer has been subordinate to this landlord, or to his family and village community.[5] And in some nations the dense population has condemned the farmer to comparatively small holdings.[6] So the social psychology of the rural development of different nations will differ in important respects. But all developments seem to have one aspect in common. There was a long period of pronounced adherence to custom succeeded by a weakening of this adherence. This change was due to the fact that the rural community ceased to be isolated and largely self-sufficient and was thrown into contact with the outside world. This in turn was due to the development of modern industry, which has not been confined to the United States and the nations of western Europe but, toward the close of the nineteenth century, became marked in the nations of Eastern Europe and in some nations of Asia.[7] The development of transportation and of manufacturing and mining, the emigration of youths from the rural districts to the industrial centres, the influence of these emigrants on their former associates in the country, the effect of this in changing the standard of living in the country, these were some of the events that caused the weakening adherence to custom. In the United States agricultural prosperity stimulated the tendency to uncustomary behaviour; in some European nations and in India excessive taxation and rents and the voracious money lender made adversity and discontent rather than prosperity and good feeling the psychological state that opened the mind to suggestions of change. The tendency toward change was increased by migration from one nation to another. The migration of peasants from European nations to the United States resulted in these immigrants stirring those who remained behind out of the lethargy of centuries of customary subservience. The immigrants wrote to those in the homeland accounts of life in the new country, sent them money, returned to visit them, and the news of the economic freedom in the New World and of the unconventional life of a new country had its effect on the old countries. We are concerned, therefore, with a psychological change that has taken place the world over, though it has different aspects in different countries and was later appearing in some countries than in others.

Certain aspects of this change, in the European nations, have re-

ceived the attention of scholars. The nation in which it has been studied with painstaking care is Poland. Thomas and Znaniecki in *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America,* distinguish three stages in the development of the Polish people. First there was a long period of adherence to custom in which the economic unit was the Polish family. This was followed by a breaking away from the traditions of the family, due to the improvement of means of communication with the outside world, the development of modern industry, the migration of peasants to the cities of their own nation and to other nations where they earned higher wages and changed their standard of living, then returned home to buy land. These conditions stirred in the Poles of the rural districts impulses for economic advancement, which resulted in changes in the old customs. The outstanding aspect of behaviour of the second period was, therefore, one of individualism. Finally came the development of co-operation, in which individualism was subordinated to new group ends, and the result was the rise of new forms of economic co-operation [8] and of the idea of an independent Polish state, which was realized as a result of the World War.

Rural development in the United States has been much less uniform than in Poland, owing to the diversity of conditions. In the East it shows stages similar to those of the Polish development. For the settlers brought with them the Old World customs and were set in adherence to custom. With the westward migration, however, the customary attitudes weakened. Some communities of settlers in the Middle West were from the first extreme in their violations of family and religious customs; [9] so their first stage resembled the second stage of Eastern rural communities, and was followed in some cases by a reaction to the customary, austere morality characteristic of the first stage of rural development in the East. It is impossible, therefore, to make any generalization covering the entire United States. But we do find three different types of rural behaviour. And the prevailing order of these types is, first, a period in which there was a pronounced adherence to custom, followed by a period of individualism characterized by impulsive departures from custom, and this by a period of re-adjustment and co-operation. When I published my *American Town* in 1906, there were beginnings of the third period in the East but it was further along in certain parts of the West. It is now in full swing in the East. In distinguishing these periods of development I do not imply a sudden transition from one type of behaviour to another. It is one continuous development.

The processes of adjustment are at work without ceasing. But at one time the behaviour of the population had the first aspect, at a later time the second, at a still later time the third. A new aspect does not come suddenly but the cumulative changes finally produce it. However it may *appear* suddenly—as co-operative marketing of farm products appeared and spread with astonishing rapidity in the later years of the third period.

The theory of three stages of development is not proved for there have not been enough inductive studies either to prove or disprove it. It is merely that the meagre researches we have seem to justify its use as a convenient hypothesis. The reader may assume that I am merely deductively applying the standard theories of the psychological development of society. For they are in line with this theory of rural development. But in the *American Town* I gave an analysis of the psychological development of a certain rural community that showed a customary period succeeded by one of individualism. Since then the co-operative period has appeared in that community and in other communities of the state. Other researches point to similar developments in various parts of the United States.

In analysing the psychological processes of rural development, I shall centre on New York in order to make the treatment intensive. As to the sources for such a study there are no books devoted to the subject. Some information can be gleaned from various books on other subjects, but one must rely largely on one's own observation. In this respect I have been fortunately situated. I was born and grew up in a community of central New York and my ancestry in that community extends back three generations to its settlement shortly after the Revolutionary War. I lived a year in the Hudson River Valley, parts of several years in the northern part of the state, and now for fifteen years have lived in the western fruit section. For twenty-five years I have been studing the psychological processes of rural development in these various parts of the state.

The aim of this study is to delineate the attitudes and beliefs of the early rural population. At the outset one is met by the fact that New York was settled by different nationalities—English, Dutch, Huguenots, Germans—and later came other peoples, Scotch, Irish, Welsh. The most important nationalities among the settlers of New York were the English and the Dutch. They differed in some respects, as will be shown later, but their essential attitudes were similar. And what differences there were diminished as time went on. An-

other cause of differences in attitudes is different types of farming. For instance, the grain farmer is apt to be somewhat less scientific and more mechanical in his farming than the fruit grower, for grain farming requires somewhat less care in production and less study of the market in selling. Now, in the early decades of rural history, farming was not specialized, so the delineation of the attitudes and beliefs of the early period is a less difficult task than would appear to one cognizant only of modern conditions.

The psychological development of rural New York falls into three periods. The first is one of pronounced adherence to custom. It extends from the rapid settlement of the rural parts and the clearing of land for cultivation after the Revolutionary War to about 1873, when the third generation had come to maturity and had inherited the wealth accumulated by previous generations and when railroads had come to ramify through the state, thus making the products of the farms generally available for export.[10] The neighbourhood was no longer largely self-sufficient for the farmer was buying factory-made goods. Industrial centres were growing and these increased the demand for farm products. The second period extends from 1874 to 1900. In 1874 the country, including the farming sections, had entered a period of financial depression which lasted until 1878. This depression resulted in certain important rural developments, among these the rise of a national society of farmers, the Patrons of Husbandry or the Grange as it came to be called. This organization started before the depression, but the hard times gave it a great impetus. Depression was followed by agricultural prosperity, and also by a notable development of manufacturing and a growth of cities. The emigration from the rural parts to the cities increased in the second period. Among those who remained in the country there were radical departures from custom, particularly in the pleasures of the population. The emigration of the young made farming more difficult, and the increasing competition with the West, where agriculture was developing, made it less profitable. These and other conditions contributed to the rural maladjustment which, later in the period, in some sections attained the proportions of a demoralization and reached its extreme point in the depression of 1894–97. Soon after 1900 began those changes in agricultural organization which promise great improvements in farming conditions. So we date the third period from 1900 to the present time. This was a period of readjustment, of the rise of state-wide organizations for the promotion of scientific farming

and co-operative marketing. This development was stimulated by gasoline transportation as that of the second period was by steam transportation. To analyse the rural development thus outlined is the purpose of this work. This book covers the first period, that is, the development up to 1874, and *The Expansion of Rural Life,* already written and awaiting publication, will include the second and third periods.

Psychological problems of rural development in the last analysis reduce to the question of changes in the relative importance of the essential tendencies of social relationship as a result of changes in material and other conditions. For instance, we find in the psychological development of New York acquisitiveness at first conspicuous, and assertiveness subordinate thereto. Then conditions changed and in the second period assertiveness became prominent in a variety of social forms but particularly in social rivalry—more so in the villages than in the rural parts but to a certain extent in the rural parts also. Again conditions changed and, partly from sheer necessity, partly from the force of expert leadership, the rural individualism began to give way before the movement for co-operation. Though co-operation sprang in the last analysis from self-interest, it was a change in behaviour that required some thought, and it fostered sympathy between farmers. Those in the co-operative organizations felt themselves shoulder to shoulder against the foes of co-operation. So in the third period the sympathetic and intellectual tendencies had somewhat more play than before. This interpretation of rural development on the basis of changes in the relative importance of essential tendencies in response to changed conditions supplements that already given. For neither customary behaviour nor the impulsive variations and individualism of maladjustment nor readjustment and co-operation is explained until we have analysed the psychological processes of those successive phases of development.

The changes in the relative importance of essential tendencies of social relationship is seen not only in New York but in other rural parts of the world. Thomas and Znaniecki make explicit the fact that, in the first period of rural life in Poland, the attitudes centred around the ownership of the land that had been the visible symbol of the family's social existence, and that no member of the family was at liberty to indulge any rivalrous impulse that was at variance therewith. Rivalry was subordinated to acquisition in the customary ways and under the rules of the family. Then conditions changed and

there "awoke a powerful tendency to economic advance, a force which pushes you forward as one peasant expressed it. This tendency was the main factor breaking down the old forms and creating new ones. . . ." [11] The rivalrous tendency awoke because conditions had changed in a way to stimulate it. It had existed all the time as a powerful inner urge that needed only the encouragement of favourable external conditions. This rivalrous tendency gave behaviour a new, individualistic, venturesome aspect. Then again conditions changed and there developed projects of economic co-operation and national independence and this tended to subordinate individual rivalry to what Thomas calls "the moral point of view." [12] That is, the individual became conscious of ends that required some control of his personal rivalrous impulses; this consciousness implied some increased play of the sympathetic and intellectual tendencies.

CHAPTER II

THE METHODS OF RURAL SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

SOCIAL psychology has yet to acquire a technique adequate to its task. Whatever technique may eventually develop, it must begin with observation of the facts of behaviour. How shall this be conducted? Some students of rural society have selected certain instincts from the classification furnished by psychologists and have sought to group facts of rural behaviour under these various instincts. This is putting interpretation before observation. My method has been to analyse rural behaviour as I found it. What one observes in the first instance are attitudes and beliefs, not instinctive processes. But my method is not merely descriptive. I begin with an extensive analysis of social attitudes and attempt some interpretation of the relation and functioning of these. Then the relation of attitudes to more fundamental processes can be investigated and changes in those processes through a period of time can be studied. This is not a complete technique but is, it seems to me, a sensible beginning.

Social attitudes cannot be traced back into individual minds and analysed in any great detail as attitudes of individual minds unless one is in intimate contact with those individuals. Intimate contact is of course impossible in a study of the earlier stages of rural development. All we can do is to describe the social attitudes, their relations and functioning, without saying in how far those attitudes were in line with or contrary to the inclinations of particular individuals. The social attitudes are, thus, habits of thought and action that determine social relationships. These attitudes may be conscious and expressed as beliefs or they may be subliminal. Even in the case of attitudes expressed as beliefs it is hardly possible to state the different forms of the belief in individual minds. Attempts to do so end in a good deal of speculation. If a speculation sounds plausible still it may not fit all individual cases for the individuals of a group are not all alike. To be sure, there are often well defined differences in belief and one must be on the alert for significant variations from

prevailing beliefs because these variations may indicate the direction of change in social relationships. However, from the mere fact that individuals remain in a family or neighbourhood or church, they implicitly unite on certain attitudes and beliefs which, therefore, explain, in the first instance, their behaviour as a group. These are what I am going to describe.

I shall write chiefly of social attitudes and beliefs. An attitude is a pronounced tendency to a certain way of reacting. Ideas are subordinate to attitudes in the rural mind. For instance, if a person is asked, "What do you think of the ticket?", meaning the list of candidates nominated by a certain party for political office, he may perhaps attempt to tell what he thinks. But he is conscious that there is more in his mind than what he thinks. If he is honest he will admit that what he thinks is largely determined by an attitude of opposition or endorsement which his thinking goes to justify. His thoughts are secondary explanations of his attitudes. They strengthen and give a setness to the attitudes. Consequently, I might have entitled the chapters of this book "Attitudes, Ideas and Beliefs," instead of merely "Attitudes," but that would have given an exaggerated impression of the extent of the habit of explaining attitudes in rural life. Especially in the early days, they seem to have functioned largely without explanations and justifications.

Attitudes are products of social experience but, as above indicated, not all attitudes are social attitudes on which the members of a group unite. The social attitudes represent the ways in which the impulses of the child become organized under the cultures of the groups in which he or she lives. There often are individuals of abnormally strong impulses which are not in line with the social attitudes of their groups. For instance, a boy of abnormally strong intellectual impulses is sometimes born and reared in a rural group. The social attitudes of the group are not congenial to these impulses, wherefore, either he leads a discontented life or leaves home for a vocation in which he can satisfy his impulses. Individuals tend to gravitate into groups that are more or less congenial so that the rank and file of people do not experience any great lack of congeniality with their groups. They are influenced by the behaviour and ideas of those around them and, without realizing it, become set to react in accordance with the prevailing social attitudes. Their individual inclinations are pretty well brought into line with the social attitudes.

People are not to any great extent conscious of the attitudes that

determine their behaviour. To be sure many attitudes are expressed as rationalized beliefs, but a greater number are merely generally prevalent ways of reacting of which people become conscious only incidentally as they try to drill them into their children or as they meet people of contrary attitudes. The people of strong contrary impulses mentioned in the preceding paragraph are an exception. They become conscious of the prevailing attitudes in the course of their conflict with them. But in the case of most people their conflict with their environment is not sufficiently severe and they are not sufficiently critical to be particularly conscious of the social attitudes of their environment. However, meeting people of contrary attitudes arouses them. Questions as to the why of the attitudes of others force them to consider the why of their own. But the tendency is to justify and excuse their own. Thus their attitudes are little subject to change. The isolation of the rural neighbourhood tended to preserve its attitudes unchanged.

In delineating the attitudes of a rural population, a good deal of what is said would be true also of the city. For people born and reared in the rural districts migrate to the cities and take their rural attitudes with them. Furthermore, urban conditions do not conduce to habits and attitudes entirely different from those of the rural districts. Wherefore, in reading this book, the reader, especially when he comes to analyses that seem to him to discredit the rural population, if he is in sympathy with that population will say, "But isn't this just as true of city people?" It may be. While there are distinctly rural attitudes, there are others that are not so distinctive. Now as to this matter of attitudes discrediting a population, that depends on a popular rather than a scientific viewpoint. The latter knows neither praise nor blame, and, as I take this point of view, I cannot consider the popular effect of analyses but shall make them with exceeding care and then leave it to the reader to divest himself as far as possible of sectional or class or sectarian feeling and with me take the scientific point of view.

The observation and analysis of the social psychologist differs from that of other scientists in that it requires intimate contact with people,[1] in which one cultivates above everything else the attitude of a sympathetic and a thinking listener. This is possible only to a limited extent in the study of the social attitudes of the past, but such contact should be had wherever possible. There are several reasons for its importance. One is the subliminal nature of a good many social

attitudes which, therefore, are not very clearly known to those actuated by them so that they have to be inferred from casual remarks and behaviour. Another is that some aspects of behaviour are especially difficult to analyse, for instance, religious attitudes; people are less apt to talk about their religion than about some other aspects of their behaviour. Still another reason for the difficulty of the task is that a considerable part of the behaviour of most people is felt to be private, that is, not to be divulged to those outside the family circle. Not that it is discreditable but merely private. Wherefore, particularly in the study of family attitudes, the behaviour seen by the observer on the outside is apt to be in one sense more or less of a pose, though it really is not so but is affected by the attitude for approval that people naturally take to outsiders. These conditions make observation difficult and necessitate intimate contact. Even then observation is fruitless unless made in an attitude of thoughtful sympathy. In that attitude observations take on a meaning that makes classification not merely a formal matter but a record of insights. Thus the interpretation grows unconsciously.

The intensive nature of psychological observation makes extensive studies very slow growths and scarcely within the power of the lone investigator unless he extends his studies over a long period of time. My method has been to make a minute study of a typical community and then to extend the investigation to other communities and make comparative studies. A typical American rural community is one of independent farmers located around a village as their trading and social centre. Their habitat, national descent and line of agriculture must be representative. The kind of agriculture is important for it affects the attitudes of the people. In the first half of the nineteenth century, in New York, farming was generally diversified so that communities were more alike in their agriculture than later. At the beginning of the second period specialization had been developing for twenty-five years, with its resulting differentiation of attitudes, so that it is in the second and third periods that this factor particularly enters in. One of the essential differences between industries in the second period was that between an industry in which there was little variation in the farm prices received for the product, for instance, grain and dairy farming, as compared with fruit growing or hop raising, in which great variations in farm prices stimulated a more or less speculative interest in marketing. As a typical rural community I have, therefore, selected the one studied in my *American Town,* in

which both the hop and the dairy industries were important. In the second period the hop industry was most important, and in the third period the dairy. In centring on this typical town I am using the method of other sciences. The biologist centres on the typical cell, the student of rural psychology on the typical rural community. My aim is to delineate the essential attitudes and beliefs of such a community. Those delineated hold true in the main, I think, of communities throughout the state, and, to a considerable extent, of communities in other states. Of course the scientific determination of what constitutes a typical community in a given population requires a study of many communities by various students, and it is hoped that this work will stimulate interest in such investigations.

A psychological investigation of this intensive kind is in marked contrast with a rural survey. The survey is a practical investigation, made in a certain short period of time by a corps of workers according to a carefully planned scheme and made with the consent and co-operation of the members of the community. A psychological study is more casual and extends over a much longer period of time. It requires more intimate contact with the group studied than can be had in the short period of a survey. The purpose of the psychological study is primarily scientific and its scope is unlimited except by scientific considerations. The survey is made for the purpose of educating the community, and is limited with this practical end in view. The survey of course involves making public the identity of the community. This is not done in the psychological study for withholding the identity gives free scope,[2] and the identity of the community has nothing to do with the value of the study.

Because of the intensive methods of rural social psychology, the best documentary sources are limited to studies made by careful students in personal contact with the groups studied and to repositories of social facts, as newspapers. In addition there are other sources of some value, as journals of travellers, diaries and autobiographies, magazine articles, works of literary men, historians, biographers and others, records of churches and rural societies, and publications of agricultural societies. Much that is recorded in the journals of travellers is superficial and biased observation. Diaries and autobiographies follow the bias of the writer, but may reveal significant attitudes. Magazine articles contain facts but often are written to stir interest and hence tend to be exaggerated. Writers strike attitudes that incite to clever writing. One of these is the attitude of

contempt and ridicule that stimulates wit, another the attitude of indignation that leads one to picture social conditions as worse than they are. Very much of this kind of writing is found not only in the files of the magazines and newspapers but also in biographies and histories. In the letters of reformers, politicians, educators and clergymen that are found in biographies and histories the writers strike attitudes that win attention but which impair the trustworthiness of their ideas and statements of fact. Writers who stressed changes for the worse often wrote with industrial centres in mind but generalized for the sake of adding interest, as if the changes were characteristic of the country as a whole. The student of rural development is not directly concerned with industrial centres. For all these reasons the documentary sources must be used with great discretion. The strictly scientific method of studying the social psychology of rural development is to make intensive studies of rural communities.

The intensive study of particular communities reduces to a minimum the effect of the personal bias of the investigator. This invariably leads to an unconscious emphasis on social attitudes that are congenial to the investigator or on attitudes that are contrary to these and so impress by contrast. For instance, lawyers emphasize the impulsive aspect of human behaviour because their business consists of settling, in accordance with law and custom, disputes between people who are intent on satisfying their "instincts," as the lawyer terms it. The behaviour of these people impresses the lawyer because of its contrast with custom-abiding behaviour and subservience to law. Again, unusually intellectual men emphasize the customary aspect of human behaviour because of its contrast with their readiness to regulate behaviour according to reason. These different lines of emphasis due to personal bias are unconscious; and writers on social psychology as well as other men are affected by unconscious bias. The best way to escape it is to centre on particular communities.

The most important documentary source for the study of rural social psychology is the rural newspaper. Dailies that circulate through the rural districts also should be examined. In 1920 there were 203 daily newspapers in New York and 526 weeklies.[3] Of the weeklies 489 were published in villages not having dailies. Most of these weeklies were country weeklies, that is, were published for the population of the village and the surrounding country.[4] The files of these

papers in a sense constitute the archives of their communities. Of course the papers are not published with a view to their value as archives, though this is by no means contrary to the ordinary purpose of a newspaper. For their purpose, at its best, is to report the doings of the community, and to foster a critical attitude to community doings in order to bring the community into line with social progress. The weeklies, in reporting the news, have tended to give too much village news and too little from the surrounding country. The selection of news has been haphazard instead of directed with a view to the economic and social development of the community. However, the paper is the fullest repository of social facts that we have. And, above all, its pages reveal the social attitudes that pervade the social intercourse of the community. For the paper is the chief means of social intercourse throughout the community.

In addition to the newspapers of the rural communities of the state there are the files of the weekly papers that circulate throughout the entire rural part of the state, of which the most important are the *Rural New-Yorker* and the *American Agriculturalist.*

This book is an outgrowth of my *American Town,* privately printed in 1906, which was a study of a town of New York State. When I refer to that town in this work I shall avoid the use of names that might disclose its identity and shall refer to it as Blanktown, to the village in the northern part as Blankville, and to its two hamlets as Blankwell and The Centre. The latter is the name by which that neighbourhood was locally known for a hundred years. The eleven school districts of the town are identical with rural neighbourhoods which have existed since the town was settled and I shall designate each of these neighbourhoods by the name by which it was locally known until recently.

The sources for the social psychology of the rural communities of New York in addition to those already mentioned include a mass of local records only a small part of which are assembled where they are accessible to students. I have found them packed away in the garrets of school houses and of the houses of former officials and old residents. Just to show what might be made available I give here a list of the sources for the development of our typical town.

1. Town-meeting records for 1796–1923.
2. Assessment rolls for most of the years of the period 1825–1923.
3. The census returns for Blanktown of the state census of 1845.

4. Census records of Blankville for 1874, 1877–82, 1885–1923.

5. Records of district school meetings of seven school districts from 1850, and less complete records of other districts.

6. More or less complete records of the Baptist, Episcopal and Presbyterian churches during their entire history and of the Methodist Church since 1874.

7. Files of the *Blanktown Intelligencer,* a weekly paper published in Pleasant Valley, for 1825–35, and of the *Blankville Times* for 1859, 1861–68, 1870–1923.

8. Records of the Board of Trustees of Blankville for 1873–1923.

9. An atlas published by D. G. Beers and Co., Philadelphia, 1874, containing a map of Blanktown that indicates the location of the homesteads of the town in 1874.

These sources are of course very meagre for the student of psychological processes. They mean little unless used in connection with the testimony of old residents. In the preparation of my *American Town,* in 1900, the testimony of several old residents in connection with the census and the assessment roll of 1845 made it possible to determine with certainty the location of about ninety-five per cent, and, with probability, that of the remaining five per cent of the families recorded as living in the town in 1845. The Beers atlas and the assessment roll of 1874, in connection with the testimony of old residents, made it possible to determine the location of the families of the town at that time. So, with a census of the town which I took in 1900, I was able to make cross sectional studies of the town in 1845, 1875, and 1900. Through the testimony of the old residents, used in connection with church and school records and the files of the weekly paper, I was able to learn of the beliefs, attitudes, and manner of life of the different families living in the town in each of those periods. Thus the testimony of old residents, used discriminately, proved to be an indispensable source of information. Among these old residents were several between eighty-two and ninety-two years of age. They had lived all their lives in the town and were in full possession of their faculties and had remarkably clear memories for people and events of their early life so that their recollections extended as far back as 1825. In addition to these old residents there were in every neighbourhood others whose memories went back to 1845 and who were able to give more or less information about each family living in their neighbourhoods in 1845. Finally in each neighbourhood there were several persons who had resided there since 1875 and could

furnish information about the town at that time and later. And data are still more abundant for the period since 1900. In other communities in different parts of the state I have found these old residents. They thoroughly enjoy answering questions for questions stir a flood of recollections. And it pleases old as well as younger people to find others who are interested in what so interests them. In all the communities studied there were sufficient documentary sources to serve as a point of departure for this exploration of the recollection of these living embodiments of the past history of the community.

A comparative study of communities extends one's knowledge of the social attitudes of the rural population indefinitely, for, however complete one may feel one's knowledge to be, one always finds something new in another community. That is, every community differs from others in certain respects so that a classification of communities is very difficult to make. As will be seen, the most general classifications have reference to the attitudes determined by the physical characteristics of the habitat, whether hilly or level and fertile, and by accessibility to markets and centres of social pleasure. Another important basis of a difference of attitudes is the prevailing agricultural industries. Then, of course, there is the nationality of the farmers and the religious affiliation. I have found certain communities, similar in physical characteristics, nearness to cities, agricultural industries and nationality, which have certain striking differences in attitudes that seem to be due to ancient differences in religious affiliation. Again, sometimes a combination of hill country, remoteness from cities, old-style agricultural industry and ancient families results in a community in which the old attitudes are unusually well preserved. On the other hand, one sometimes finds an astonishing persistence of certain old attitudes in the most progressive communities, for instance, respect for old people and the manners by which this respect is shown. In spite of this marked difference in the psychology of various communities, certain attitudes are found in all. The trends in these attitudes can be traced by the aid of the testimony of old residents. In the determination of these essential attitudes and their trends accuracy depends not only on the extent of one's own investigations but also on a wide acquaintance with other careful observers. It is the scarcity of observers more than anything else that hampers this development of inductive social psychology.

The emphasis thus far has been on observation and analysis, intensive and extensive. In addition the investigator should have

some idea of the theoretical significance of his investigation. Some investigations of rural communities seem to have been planned merely with a view to presenting an idea numerically and graphically, with little or no consideration of the question, "What of it?" Of course it is difficult to consider what of it until we have a good many of these ideas as data for generalizations. Still some investigations would have been more fruitful if the author, along with his presentation, had given some indication of the significance, for him, of the investigation. An idea is not of particular value just because it can be presented graphically. The need of a theoretical approach is evident also in extensive investigations that are made in connection with proposed reforms. Certain recent investigations of rural institutions in New York are merely a mass of facts with recommendations, but without any interpretation that gives significance to the facts or leads up to the recommendations in a way to explain why they were made. In such a case the presumption is that they were prompted by the personal attitudes of the investigator so that the investigation, in so far as its purpose was to make convincing proposals of reforms, largely loses its force. Now in a psychological investigation of a population we are dealing with facts that cannot be expressed graphically or numerically except to a very limited extent. Also they are a kind of facts that cannot be understood except as a development out of the past where graphical and numerical formulation is still more difficult. But studies that can make use of graphical and numerical methods may have a relation to the psychological investigations and it would be well, in such studies, to indicate their broad significance.

CHAPTER III

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD AND THE COMMUNITY

NEW YORK lies at the northern end of the Appalachian mountain system, which stretches southwestward to the Gulf of Mexico. Across the state runs the lowest divide in that system. This divide has been the main thoroughfare between the Atlantic Ocean and the Mississippi Valley. It includes the Hudson and Mohawk valleys, the Finger Lakes region and the country lying to the north of this to Lake Ontario. It divides the state into three main upland regions, a central and northeastern, a southern, and a southeastern. Of the 47,620 square miles of land surface of the state, about one-third is lowland and the rest hilly and some mountainous. These physiographic features determined the course of settlement of the state by the whites and its later agricultural and industrial development. The settlers followed the great divide and established outposts, which later developed into cities. At the eastern end of the divide stands New York and at the western end Buffalo. Between these two centres of industry and commerce, at central points of production and communication, are the other large cities. Out in the side valleys are the smaller cities and further on in the valleys and on the slopes are the villages that form the trade centres of the rural communities.[1]

These communities are the objects of our study. It does not fall within the scope of this book to describe the physiography of New York or the history of its agriculture. These topics are treated in various books.[2] This book is concerned with the human side of the rural development. Of this side Dr. L. H. Bailey writes in his preface to Fippin's *Rural New York,* after mentioning the documents on which the historian of New York agriculture depends: "Unfortunately the personal human documents are largely to be written." In tracing the human side of rural development we are, therefore, thrown largely on our own resources.

The permanent settlement of New York began in 1623 when the Dutch acquired Manhattan Island from the Indians. During the seventeenth century settlements were made as far north as

Schenectady, mostly by the Dutch. In the latter part of the century the English and the Huguenots began to settle lower New York. About the beginning of the eighteenth century German Protestants began to settle in the Hudson Valley. During the eighteenth century settlements spread up the Mohawk Valley but western New York was slowly settled. It is said that as late as 1780 there were in all western New York beyond Cayuga Lake only about one thousand whites. The acquisition of New York by the English in 1684 stimulated the inflow of English immigrants, who came largely from New England. They predominated in the settlement of western New York. These different nationalities represented also different religious sects and, because of this mingling of sects, New York developed an attitude of greater tolerance than New England.[3]

The settlers of New York followed the waterways and the Indian trails. They went up the Hudson and the Mohawk and portaged from those rivers to others along which they paddled into Lakes George and Champlain, into northern New York, into Lake Ontario and the Finger Lakes region of central New York. The latter was the great Indian thoroughfare to the west and was the route most used by the whites until the building of the Erie Canal and the railroads.[4] In lower New York routes led through the Catskills to the headwaters of the Delaware and the Susquehanna, by which rivers and their tributaries the western parts of the state were accessible as far as the headwaters of the Genesee. This river was followed to a point from which there was a portage to the Allegheny River. Indian trails ramified from these waterways through the dense forest in every direction. These were narrow, sometimes worn a foot deep and difficult to traverse by pack animals. So settlement was retarded until roads were gradually built. A road was early laid out along the Hudson from New York to Albany, another to Clinton County, another from the Hudson to the Delaware River, another along the Mohawk to Utica and thence to Syracuse, Auburn, Geneva and eventually to Buffalo and the Genesee River. Another road extended from Utica into northern New York. These and other roads had been built before 1800. About 1790 began the movement for the construction of canals. After various small canals had been built larger ones were projected. The Champlain Canal was completed in 1823 and the Erie Canal in 1825. From the main line of the latter, various branches were constructed in the next fifteen years. At the same time with the building of canals the government was building roads to

connect points inland with cities and villages on the canals. These projects were still incomplete when the building of railroads began. By 1837 the steam railroad had reached across the state to Rochester, just before the great increase in immigration from Europe in the 'forties.

The rural population of the state was grouped in families, neighbourhoods and villages. Neighbourhoods were grouped around a village and this larger group formed the rural community. The neighbourhood was a group of families that were conscious of more or less intimate relations with one another. The early New York neighbourhood was not as strictly a farming community as rural neighbourhoods are to-day. It was apt to include artisans and might boast of a local industry, a tavern, a store, a doctor. To-day the artisans, the local industries, hotels, stores and doctors are located in the villages. Thus the community has increased and the neighbourhood has diminished in importance as a rural unit. In the early days the centre of the community was the church. It was not only a place of worship but also a centre of influence for fostering those family, economic, religious and other attitudes and beliefs that were essential in the character of the people of the community.

We do not know how many communities and neighbourhoods there have been in New York in the past nor, indeed, how many there are at the present time because the boundaries of these social groups do not coincide with the boundaries of the civil divisions that serve as the enumeration units of the census-taker. According to the New York State census of 1915 there were then eight hundred and twenty-six incorporated villages in the state. Most of these were centres of rural communities and most of them were in existence before the Civil War though not all as incorporated villages.[5] We may assume then that there were at that time at least that number of communities in the state.

The structure of the neighbourhood and the community next engages our attention. In order to make this clear we shall centre on our typical town. In doing this, as structure was everywhere similar we shall be defining the prevailing structure of the rural groups of the state. The settlers of the typical town came over the main Indian thoroughfare to the outpost of A and from there traversed the trail that wound up the valley from A to the northern boundary of our town. Later the Erie Canal and, still later, the main line of one of the most important railroads of the state passed through the city of

A. A stage road early was built connecting our town with A. Not until 1867 was the town connected with A by a railroad. The settlers brought their belongings on horseback and on their own backs, later in lumber wagons, when the trail had broadened into a road. They built log houses and lived therein until a saw-mill had been constructed, when they made lumber and built frame houses. The settlers of the town segregated in twelve neighbourhoods. Some years after the first settlement, the turnpike road which was being built across the state was laid down through the town. It passed through The Centre and that neighbourhood became the trading and social centre of the town. Town meetings and the town court were held at The Centre. There the majority of the people attended church and a considerable number of children attended a "select school." With the completion of the Erie Canal, A, now a flourishing young city, was connected by water with the seaboard. The stage road above referred to connected the village in the northern part of our town with A. This village, Blankville, then became the trading centre of the town and, before many years, all the churches of the town were located in Blankville.

Our town was the southern part of a community that centred around the village lying in the northern part of the town. A very small part of the community extended over into the town to the north. But only a small part of the town to the north lay in this community. So I have included the one town instead of two in the special study. I take the town as the typical group because most of the documentary sources are for the town and not for the entire community. This work may, therefore, be taken as, among other things, a contribution to a clearer conception of what we mean in the psychological sense by a rural community with its constituent neighbourhoods.

The early farmer in New York and elsewhere was largely independent of the outside world.[6] He raised all the food he consumed except salt and such luxuries as tea, coffee, spices. He lived well too, after the land had been cleared and made productive. He had various kinds of meat, dairy products, vegetables, cereals, fruit, honey and maple sugar. He cut his own lumber and had it sawed at the local mill; got his paint at the local paint factory; his brick and tile at the local factory; had his grain ground at the local grist mill; had his skins tanned at the local tannery and the shoes of his family made by the local cobbler; got his pottery at the local pottery works; made his soap and tallow candles; and had many of his tools made by the local blacksmith or made them himself. He raised his wool and flax and

the family either carded the wool by hand or sent it to the factory from which it came back in rolls to be spun into yarn on the spinning wheel by the housewife and her daughters. The yarn was taken to the fulling mill where it was woven and dyed and with this cloth the women made the clothing of the family. The farmer might also get an organ at a local organ factory. And to assist him in making or repairing the various things he needed there were the local carpenter, wagon-maker, shingle-maker, cooper, harness-maker, clock-mender.[7] This sketch of the independence and isolation of the early neighbourhood enables us to realize with what facility the politicians could promote the idea that the nation ought to be economically independent of, and isolated from the outside world. This belief persisted long after the primitive conditions which made it seem plausible had passed away.

The strong social consciousness of the neighbourhood rested on its economic self-sufficiency. The feeling was further increased by the kinship ties in many neighbourhoods.[8] If not related by blood the families were apt to have come from the same part of New England or Europe.[9] Neighbourhood consciousness has weakened since those early days, but the neighbourhoods have not entirely disappeared. They persist where people are so isolated that it is difficult to go to the village frequently or where the local interest centres in some neighbourhood institution as a church or school. The neighbourhood continues to function in various ways. For instance, though the Farm Bureau unit is the town, the work of the town committee of the Bureau is most effectively carried on by observing neighbourhood divisions and by each member of the committee working with the farmers of his neighbourhood.[10] Because of the emulation between neighbourhoods, leaders can get action by telling the farmers of one neighbourhood what those of another are doing.

The distinction commonly made to-day between the neighbourhood and the community is that the neighbourhood renders at most only two or three forms of service—has only a church, a school, a store—while the village at the centre of the community furnishes most of the services enjoyed by the rural people.[11] This distinction based on services rendered is brought forward in the absence of the old-time psychological characteristic of the neighbourhood, that is, neighbourliness. In the beginning the neighbourhood consciousness was based on the economic self-sufficiency of the neighbourhood, on co-operation between neighbours, on kinship, long acquaintanceship and intimate social

intercourse. The community consciousness, on the other hand, was comparatively weak and centred around the church more than any other one institution.[12] Of course a church membership was not co-extensive with a community but it was through going to church that people got their only regular and frequent experience of a social life larger than that of the neighbourhood. The old phrase "going to meeting," which was almost entirely used instead of our "going to church," signified this function of the church as the meeting place of a larger number of families than took part in the small neighbourhood gatherings.

CHAPTER IV

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND PSYCHOLOGICAL PROCESSES

THE analysis of the attitudes of a rural population naturally begins with a study of the psychological effects of the features of the physical environment, particularly of climate, topography, fertility of soil, accessibility to markets and to centres of social pleasure.

Climate

Climate depends on latitude, altitude, topography, position with reference to lakes or ocean and to the cyclonic air currents across the continent. New York is in a latitude in which, during several months of the year, it is cold enough to snow. In the regions near the Great Lakes the rigour of the winter is slightly alleviated by the cyclonic air currents which blow over the lakes toward the east and warm the air over the adjacent land somewhat, as the lake water is warmer in winter than the land until the lakes freeze. The melting ice in the spring cools the air and ordinarily keeps the fruit trees from budding until the danger from frost has passed. In the hill country local winds are caused by the flow of cooled air down steep slopes, which makes the climate cooler.[1] Much of New York is hill country and this makes the air somewhat cooler than it would otherwise be. Nearness to lakes and ocean causes a high rainfall and snowfall. Thus the winter climate is rigorous and this has had a pronounced effect on the attitudes of the population. In the first decades the farmer and his boys worked in the woods during most of the winter. Farmers who were boys in this period tell of the winter days in the woods, the hard and exhilarating work, the noon-day meal of luke-warm coffee and frozen fried-cakes, the chilling ride home exposed to the icy blast. Endurance of cold was one of the essential attitudes of the rural population. The severe cold of winter and the heat of summer increased the discomforts of the farmer's life that had to be borne, and the attitude of endurance of cold and heat enhanced the general attitude

of self-restraint which, as we shall see, was so important in determining the character of the farmer. This self-restraint is said to have been still more pronounced among the farmers of New England; and one reason for it is said to have been the greater rigour of the New England climate.[2] In New York the attitude of endurance of extremes of climate was pronounced. "Oh, it isn't so bad" was one of the customary ways of expressing the attitude. The farmers prided themselves on their endurance and contemned those who shrank from unpleasant weather. Endurance of cold and suffering from extremes of weather is less necessary than formerly. The stove and the furnace have replaced the old fireplace. The farmer rides to town in a closed, heated auto instead of in an open carriage or sleigh. There is little winter work in the woods. The attitude of endurance is less pronounced than among the early population.

Another aspect of climate that may have affected New Yorkers somewhat is the humid atmosphere and cloudy sky.[3] A high humidity and much cloudy weather conduces to mental apathy, while a low humidity and much sunshine stimulates the nervous system. While the climate of New York is not extremely humid and cloudy it is more so than that of many western states. This may have contributed somewhat, though in a very minor degree, to the conservatism of New York. More important causes of conservatism will be mentioned later.

Topography and Fertility

New York had an extensive area of rich valleys and fertile hills, until the latter became worn by deforestation, constant cropping, leaching and erosion. Topography has affected psychological processes in New York in two ways: (1) Certain topographical features selected people of certain attitudes; (2) certain features developed certain attitudes. We can best make clear these effects by giving a concrete description, and, for this purpose, we shall centre on our typical town. The topography of the town is typical of a good deal of the state. The natural entrance to the town is at its northern boundary, from which a valley runs southwest through the town with hill country on each side. At the southern boundary the valley is narrow so that the entire southern part of the town is hilly. Some of the hillsides are too steep for successful cultivation but they have been stripped of trees and put under cultivation or used as pasture land. The steepness of

these hills was an obstacle to communication between Blanktown and the towns to the south and east. Blanktown always has been more intimately acquainted with the population to the north and west than with that to the south and east. When settled the town included considerable territory lying to the south and east of its present limits, from which it was separated in answer to a petition of the inhabitants to the state legislature which asked the separation on the ground that the "range of high hills" to the south and east was "difficult to be traversed." With the towns to the south and east, then, our town has had comparatively little communication. Those towns have had their own trading centres. Furthermore, the population of Blanktown has differed psychologically from that of the towns to the south and east. The successful farmers in the eastern and southern hill country, as the years went by sold their worn-out farms and bought fine farms in the central and northern valley. So there developed a sense of fundamental difference between the two populations. The valley farmer had the attitudes of the successful worker, not only the economic but also the religious attitudes. He was persistent in work and despised a farmer who would leave his work during the week to attend a religious service. In the town to the south the farmers were more indifferent workers, more given to religious frenzy, more apt to follow after preachers of strange doctrines, to "swallow" stories of local miracles that to the more practical Blanktownsman seemed "all stuff and nonsense."[4] Thus this shifting of population resulted in economically and psychologically distinct communities conscious of their unlikeness. I have observed this process in other parts of New York. So much for the first effect of topography above mentioned.

We turn now to the effect of topography in developing certain attitudes. The hill country tended to develop patience and resignation. A farmer could not hurry to town. He had to take half a day for it. He could not rush work on a steep hillside. He had to learn to go slow if he was inclined to the contrary. He had to resign himself to the hard work and poor crops of a hill farm. In winter the roads between the hills were impassable for weeks at a time because of the deep snow. "You have to take it in the hill country," they say. On the other hand this easy-going willingness to let events take their course tended to inefficiency on a rich valley farm where additional effort was well rewarded. The farmer who was of a "driving" temperament got out of the hill country as soon as he could. He had not the patience for

it. The social conditions of the hill country, particularly the isolation, also encouraged an easy-going attitude, for the main roads extended through the valleys, and farmers would drive along the road and eye the farms an each side. The hill farmers did not have this social incentive to industry. So social as well as topographical conditions did not encourage persistent work in the hill country as in the valley.

Because of the lack of initiative resulting from the topography and the isolation the farmers of the hilly parts of the state were less quick to adopt new agricultural methods, slower to raise their standard of living and generally more fixed in adherence to custom than those in the valleys. The farmers in the hill country to the south and east of our typical town retained the uncouth dress, the speech and manners of the backwoodsman long after these had been discarded in our typical town. The hill farmers not only kept their primitive ways but had a kind of conceit that their ways were the best.

Accessibility to Markets and Social Centres

Accessibility to markets and centres of social pleasure has had a profound effect on the farmers of the state. The building of canals and roads opened up the state for settlement and stimulated the production of cereals, animal products and lumber, also the manufacture of these products in hundreds of small mills and factories, and the transportation of them to the centres of consumption and export. The regions favourably situated on natural waterways were especially prosperous. Then came the railroads which ramified through the state and connected the rural parts with the outside world. This stimulated specialization in the production, for export, of the crops which the various sections were best fitted to produce. Half a century later improved roads and the auto, which made possible the rapid handling of milk, facilitated the change from various types of specialized farming that had impoverished the soil, as hop and grain farming, to dairy farming which tends to maintain the fertility of the soil if properly conducted. This return to diversified farming resulted in changes in the attitudes of the population.

Processes of Social Change

In the analysis of the social psychology of rural development we have to consider, then, certain distinct processes. First, there is what

may be called the logic of the development. The development of specialized farming that took place in New York would not have come without the development of railway transportation. The development of dairy farming and of co-operation in selling milk would not have come as quickly and completely as it did without the improvement of roads and gasoline transportation. One change makes possible another and suggests its feasibility. This process of social change has a mental correlation in the development of the mind whereby the solving of one problem makes it possible to solve another. The logical process of development has been discussed in the rural districts of the state by the local philosophers around the stove in the store on winter evenings for fifty years or more. In our typical town Mr. C—— would suggest how remarkable it was that the invention of the telegraph followed so closely on that of the steam railroad inasmuch as the railroad necessitated the telegraph. Then some one would point out that the railroad made possible the transportation of agricultural products and the telegraph made possible the transmission of market quotations even from foreign countries and the effect of this on agricultural industry would be discussed, always, of course, from the local point of view.

In addition to the logical aspect of development, there are the more distinctly psychological processes with which we are concerned. I never heard these talked about and, so far as I can ascertain, no effort has been made in the course of public education to inform pupils, in the rural schools or elsewhere, of these processes of their own development.

In addition to its logical and psychological aspects social change has a fortuitous side. The inventor quite often makes important discoveries by chance. Changes in the material side of rural culture seem sometimes to have come by chance—by chance relations of the demand for a commodity to the supply of it or by the chance of a certain man settling in the region and introducing a new crop.

The psychological processes of New York communities differed in certain essentials from those of the west. For instance, comparing our typical town with towns in the prairie region of the west which I have studied, one of the essential differences seems to be the more pronounced rivalrous disposition and speculative economic attitude of the western towns. This is due to a number of conditions. First, the western settlers were far removed from the region of settled habits in the east. Second, they had a keen sense of the superiority of their

country over the eastern farming region and this stimulated an optimistic imagination. Third, the west was settled in the days of the building of steam railroads, which, it was anticipated, would cause an immense rise in land values. The anticipation was intensified by other conditions. Simultaneously with the settlement of the west came the invention of farming machinery that facilitated the working of level land. Also the region was wonderfully fertile, as well as clear of forests and thus was naturally adapted to the extensive use of farm machinery. All this caused an extreme development of the speculative attitude.[5] In southern Minnesota, "many of the so-called 'Yankee' settlers took up the land merely as a speculation, preferring to 'try their luck at farming the farmer.' Accordingly we find them 'going into business, running stores, mills, and politics.' At that time very few of the foreign-born element 'had the training to get into these grafts.'"[6] Then came the German and Norwegian immigrants and "not being afraid of work, they took to the soil naturally, renting from or buying out the original owners of the land, after having worked as hired help for a few years."[7] But the foreigners caught the speculative tendency. This tendency stimulated the imagination and tended to make the people as a whole somewhat less set in their beliefs than in the East. Their passion was for the growth of the village or city, for booming the land values of the surrounding country. The West selected pioneers of a speculative attitude from the East and then the western conditions accentuated that attitude. This selection reacted on the East to intensify adherence to custom there, for the conventional people were left behind. At the same time the opening up of the West depressed land values in the East. So, particularly on the frontier, there always was an expectation of prosperity, a sense of the superiority of the opportunities of the West over those in the East. And the influence of those who won riches, their assurance and elation, infected the less successful.[8] The influential people were the successful speculators, of which every village was apt to have one or more. They inclined to conviviality in social life, wherefore their influence was against the conventional austerity supported by the churches. Hence the tendency in the West to be less set in adherence to dogma than in the East.

It has been suggested that the topography of the West had a direct effect on the imagination, that the vast spaces of the prairie tended to stir the imagination. While this might be the effect of the first sight of the prairies on the easterner, it seemed to me that if the

westerners were somewhat more imaginative than the easterners it was not due to the direct effect of the landscape on the mind but to their different economic situation and the attitudes thus fostered. Their situation stirred an expectancy of material prosperity and their agriculture was of a kind to invite new methods and machinery and so to accustom the mind to the idea of change.

The predominant disposition in the East was the acquisitive. The emphasis was on working and saving. As to working, the hill country did not permit extensive use of farm machinery, and this made the farmer's life one of excessive action. This was one of the main causes of the extreme adherence to custom that characterized the eastern rural neighbourhoods. The emphasis in the East was also on saving. In the West the great extent of rich land made unnecessary the extreme thrift of the East—the raking of scatterings, the endless picking up of stone—a habit of mind that may be carried so far as to prevent the use of imagination on larger problems. Finally, the acquisitive disposition in the East was fostered by the fact that there the farmer at first produced almost everything he consumed, and the tradition of this economic self-sufficiency survived long after specialized production for the market had developed. The westerner, on the contrary, produced for the market from the beginning, got his return in money rather than in crops for his own consumption, and lived off his bank account. Specialized farming and a bank account encourages getting away somewhat from the extreme thrift of a population that has no bank account, buys little and lives off its own crops.

CHAPTER V

ATTITUDES TO THE WEATHER AND THE MOON

THE behaviour of rural people always has been different from that of city people. This is due to the different conditions under which they live and work. First, rural people are more exposed to the weather and more dependent on the weather and the seasons for their prosperity. Second, they are more isolated. Third, in their economic life they are in constant contact with nature and are less concerned with people—are more "independent," as they say—than those in other occupations. Fourth, the farmer's work is more confining than that of any other occupation. If he keeps live stock, he must work every day in the year. The separate effects of these various conditions on the character of the rural population can be traced only to a very limited extent. To be sure, certain attitudes are plainly much more a result of one set of conditions than of others. Certain attitudes are plainly a result of exposure to uncertain weather, certain others of dependence on the uncertain weather and the uncertain seasons for the fruition of crops, certain others of isolation, certain others of independence, and certain others of the hard and confining work of the farmer. But we should not want to say that any attitude, as we see it in the behaviour of the early farmer, was exclusively a result of one set of conditions. For instance, the uncertainty of the weather caused an attitude of indecision. But indecision as we see it in the farmer was accentuated by his reserve due to his isolation. His reserve, in turn, was accentuated by his independence and his constant work. We cannot determine just how much each of the several conditions under which the rural family lived determined its behaviour. But we can show how certain conditions predominantly determined certain attitudes. In this chapter we are concerned with the effects of the weather. In describing weather attitudes we do not by any means imply that adaptation to the weather was the sole determining condition of those attitudes.

Attitudes to the Weather

Certain aspects of the physical environment aroused a never failing interest among farmers, especially aspects that had to do with the weather and the seasons. The farmer's prosperity depended on whether the season was favourable or unfavourable and also on the changes in the weather from day to day. Hence his interest in the weather. His first thought when he awoke in the morning was, "I wonder what kind of a day it's going to be," and his first act was to look out and see. His last thought at night was of what the weather might be on the morrow. This interest was due to the effect of the weather on the farmer's movements from day to day. He got the ground all prepared to sow his grain and "then it came on and rained and there was no living with him, for he had to sit around till the rain was over and then do his work all over again." If there was anything that irritated the busy farmer it was to have the weather interfere with his work. He got resigned by use of some such formula as "Man proposes but God disposes." This was not a mere phrase but a formula that brought into action the religious attitude of resignation. The irreligious farmer developed an attitude of I-won't-worry-anyway. Whether religious or not the resigned attitude grew on the farmer with the years until he often irritated his wife by his apparently placid acceptance of everything as it came. The less he worried, the more she worried at his not worrying. For not to worry sometimes came to mean not to think at all so that the mother sometimes said to the daughter who wanted her father to do something, "You know your father doesn't worry about anything so you must impress it on him." The wife, having less to do directly with the weather, developed less of the weather resignation. There were, of course, exceptions to this situation. The husband sometimes was the person who worried, the wife the one who did not, but it was a general belief that "farming is no occupation for a man who worries." Such men were quite apt to get out of farming and go into some calling where resignation as an adaptive quality was not so imperative.

The uncertainty of the weather was one of the conditions that required resignation as an adaptive attitude. Other rural conditions accentuated that attitude. Because of his isolation the farmer could not readily find diversion to distract him from disappointments due to the weather, and left to himself he had to develop resignation.

Another condition that accentuated resignation was the hard and confining nature of his occupation.

Uncertainty and chance-taking are necessary features of other undertakings than agriculture,[1] but, in the latter, because of the large part played by the weather, it seems less possible to control the course of events by an unusual effort or an exercise of intelligence than in business and the professions. For this reason, in planting his crops and deciding what to plant and how much, the farmer thought of the ultimate outcome as decided by forces outside himself over which he had no control. "Whatever is to be will be" was the way he expressed it. This attitude he transferred to a great variety of situations. It resigned him not only to unfavourable weather and a bad season but also to reverses due to the uncertainty of business conditions. And this behaviour continues to-day. For instance, if a farmer does not sell his crop at the time of the highest price and you say to him, "Too bad you did not know it," he is apt to reply, "No, I don't think so, if it had been best for me to know it, I would have known." It is a common belief that it is best that we do not know the future for, if we did, we could not stand the thought of the troubles before us. The best way is not to know and then to be resigned to whatever comes. This general attitude was seen in reaction to disappointment or loss of any kind and reflected the prevailing experience, an experience of trouble, hardship and disappointment, which made men in earnest in their cultivation of resignation.

Strange to say, though the farmer was constantly taking a chance on the seasons—for when he planted he did not know that he would reap—yet he was not conscious of this as chance-taking. This appeal to chance was so habitual that he was not conscious of it. On the other hand, any unusual appeal to chance was thought of as chance-taking and a farmer felt particularly good over a lucky decision. An investment of money was thought of as chance-taking. Many, perhaps most farmers did not like a deliberate appeal to chance, unless it was in a horse-trade. They were generally averse to taking a chance in the investment of money, though there were many exceptions to this rule, especially in a period of rising prices and speculation. The men who enjoyed taking a chance were apt to go into some kind of speculation, as horse or cattle trading, or to emigrate west where they could speculate in land, or to go to the cities. The typical New York farmer's habit of "hanging on to what he has got" and his averseness to "running into debt" inclined him against chance-taking that in-

volved the investment of money. This attitude, in contrast to that of business, is seen in certain rural sections to-day where business men from the city have gone into fruit farming. Because of their habit of borrowing for production the business men are less averse to risking money in new ventures than is a neighbour who always has been a farmer.

Because of the constant appeal to chance in the course of work, this trait was prominent in his recreation. The farmer enjoyed betting games.[2] "You bet" was an idiom in common use. Farmers lost no good chance to bet. They paused before a calf or a hog was weighed to wager how much it would weigh. Of course they did not bet money, usually, but wagered just for the fun of it. At parties they bet on each other's weight and on the weight of the girls. Then the blushing damsels stepped on the scales and the boys who lost their bets paid the "forfeits." Almost any farmer was ready to swap horses on occasion. This is an appeal to chance for "a horse is deceitful above all things."

Out of the uncertainty of the weather developed the habit of regarding the results of work as beyond one's control. Since the results were uncertain, because these depended on the seasons, if a man had worked industriously, he had done the best he could and could not be blamed if the results were poor. This does not mean that the farmer was indifferent to the results of his work. He sowed in order to reap. His purpose was to get results and no sight was so pleasing as that of his growing crops with their promise of a bountiful harvest. His attention was on the crop itself so that many farmers showed a strange indifference to the marketing of their crops after they had been harvested and stored. This attitude was due to the fact that in the early days the farmer produced primarily for his own consumption and not for the market. At first he was interested primarily in the crop results and not until later primarily in the financial results. At the same time it is true that, in the last analysis, the emphasis was on industrious working more than on the results. For, unless he worked industriously he would have no crops and, if he did work industriously, he might have none, in which case the comfortable frame of mind to cultivate was that, inasmuch as he had worked industriously he had done the best he could. So industrious working was emphasized above results.

This attitude has been of immense economic, political, religious and educational significance in rural life. As to its economic significance

the idea was that in any unfavourable situation, as a spell of bad weather or an epidemic of plant or animal diseases or a time of falling prices of agricultural products, the farmer "must just work a little harder," and so make up for the handicap as best he could. This attitude also resigned him to political injustices. If taxed unjustly his attitude was just to work a little harder, as he would work a little harder to overcome the handicap of a cold, wet spring. This attitude was essential also in religious resignation for the idea was that if a farmer worked industriously and did the best he could, he could trust God to give divine help when he needed it. "God helps those who help themselves." This attitude was prominent also in rural education. Parents told their children to "work hard whether you learn anything or not. What you need is to learn to apply yourself." It is this attitude to education that has kept the farmer fairly contented with a system of public education that gives little knowledge, awakens little interest in pupils and does not train the mind to meet vital problems but centres on discipline in industrious working.

This attitude is pronounced and widely significant also in the behaviour of the rural populations of Europe. Immigrants from Great Britain, Germany and other nations testify to it among their home people. Thomas and Znaniecki write of the Polish farmer: "The ultimate result of farm work does not depend exclusively upon the worker himself; his best efforts can be frustrated by unforeseen circumstances and in a particularly good year even negligent work may be well repaid. On a background of religious and magical beliefs this incalculable element gives birth to a particular kind of fatalism. . . . The essential point is to get the help of God, the distributor of good, against the indifferent forces of nature and the intentionally harmful magical forces of hostile men and of the devil. Now . . . the process of work itself is a means of influencing God favourably; it is even the most indispensable condition of assuring God's help, for without it no religious magic will do any good." [3] That is, by industrious work the farmer influences God favourably. We would not say that the American and the Polish farmer put the same relative emphasis on industriousness and on supernatural aid. One might say that the American farmer placed the emphasis on industrious working and also regarded it as one means of getting supernatural aid, while the Polish farmer is more absorbed in the supernatural side of production. But Americans placed a good deal of emphasis on the supernatural. The American farmer was, however, in a position

more favourable to industriousness, because of his independent ownership of land, than are European peasants who work under landlords.

Agricultural populations have, until recently, been comparatively easy to handle politically. This has been due in part to the weather attitudes of the farmers, to their resignation, their absorption in the process of work, their tendency to be satisfied with a mere living. So in Europe the landlord could divert to himself a good part of the products of their labour, much as a bee-keeper, by clever manipulation, takes a large part of the product of the industrious bee. The attitudes which made farmers an easy prey of landlords later resigned them to exploitation by business men and financial interests. For farmers conceived the processes of the business world much as they had those of nature, as incalculable, and emphasized mere industriousness instead of shrewd dealing with shrewd men.

While the farmer's attitude of absorption in the process of work was contrary to the business attitude which centres on the financial results of work, the farmer's attitude passed into the business world and is found there along with the business attitude. Farmer boys carried it into business and the professions and men believed, and still do believe, that they should not look primarily to the financial results; that, if a man has worked hard and has done the best he knew, whatever the results are, he has done well. This attitude is to be contrasted with the modern business attitude, which more and more has tended toward an emphasis on financial results; often these are the results of lucky speculation which involves little or no industrious working. Consequently in studies of the behaviour of business men we must always be looking for rural attitudes in business as distinguished from the typical business attitude.[4] Some of the most successful business men were born and reared on the farm and owe their achievements to the fact that their speculative attitude was balanced by the old rural attitudes of industry and thrift. Also, in studies of the behaviour of scientific men we must always be looking for rural attitudes in connection with the typical scientific attitude.[5] Some of the greatest scientists were born and grew up in the country and owe their achievements to the fact that their scientific curiosity was reinforced by the rural attitudes of industry and thrift. The latter are seen in the tireless collection of facts and the saving of all facts, even those that served no scientific purpose at the time. As great a scientist as Darwin, in his autobiography, refers to his industry in a way that implies that he took great satisfaction in it, for instance, "My industry

has been nearly as great as it could have been in the observation and collection of facts." And he tells us that it was the thought of his industry that gave him greatest comfort when the results of his industry were severely criticized. "When I have found that I have blundered, or that my work has been imperfect, and when I have been contemptuously criticized, and even when I have been overpraised, so that I have felt mortified, it has been my greatest comfort to say hundreds of times to myself that 'I have worked as hard and as well as I could, and no man could do more than this.' " [6] Emphasis on unflagging industry is an attitude that has been prominent in the behaviour of scientists. Now it is not maintained that occupations other than agriculture will not develop this attitude or that it is solely a result of occupation at all. The habit of industry naturally develops in a temperamentally active person. What is maintained is that agriculture and the social contacts of the farmer's community were favourable to it and that, thus acquired, it was carried by farmer boys into other occupations.

Industriousness was, of course, not due entirely or essentially to the uncertainty of the weather. We have shown that it was merely accentuated by adverse weather. It was due to the hard and confining nature of the farmer's occupation. He could not, like hunting peoples, lay off until he began to feel the pangs of hunger. From the time he began to prepare the ground for the seed his livelihood depended on his industrious cultivation of his crop. His animals required attention at least twice a day every day in the year. Industriousness was due also to the farmer's isolation. To be sure working with industrious associates stimulates industry. On the other hand associates may distract one from one's work. Because of his isolation the farmer was free of distractions. Industriousness was due also to the farmer's independence. Because he owned his land and his instruments of production all he produced was his own. This independence stimulated exertion. Even exposure to the weather stimulated industriousness for exposure developed endurance and endurance enabled the farmer to restrain feelings of weariness and discomfort that interfered with industriousness. Wherefore every condition under which the farmer lived contributed in one way or another to industriousness.

Certain intellectual attitudes, also, were plainly accentuated by the uncertainty of the weather. This uncertainty inclined the farmer to hesitate to plan for the future any more than was necessary. So he

was slow to make up his mind about anything, and slow to engage to do anything. He preferred to wait till the time came or to wait as long as possible. So his wife, whose work depended less on the weather than her husband's, often was more decisive than he and had to make up his mind for him when the question at issue involved the movements of others so that a decision had to be made. But the women often had as pronounced an attitude of indecision as the men, because they derived their attitudes from the group atmosphere, in which indecision was pronounced. The phrases "I guess so" and "I guess not," so frequently used in the rural districts, indicate this indecisive attitude of mind. Sometimes the farmer was a bit obstinate in his indecision. He wanted to keep the others waiting and show that nothing could begin to move until he gave the word.

Of course the attitude of indecision cannot be said to have developed entirely from dependence on the weather. It is seen in men whose occupation requires constant reflection. Their minds are never quite made up on anything. Also, many men are temperamentally inactive, timid and indecisive. Also it is the characteristic attitude in a situation before which one is uncertain. But uncertainty is not due entirely to the situation. It is due to lack of available knowledge. The farmer would be much less cautious and conservative, much more progressive if he availed himself of the knowledge within his reach. But, as will be shown presently, his attitudes caused him to depreciate scientific knowledge, to mull over and justify his own ideas. And one of the causes of this cautious, conservative attitude among farmers has been their dependence on the weather.

Often indecision was not so pronounced as to impair efficiency but expressed itself in what was called the cautious attitude. The cautious farmer committed himself as little as possible but did not lack for decision at the vital moment. Farmer boys carried this attitude into business and politics and into the professions. It was seen in the administrator who took as his motto, "Learn by taking one step how to take the next." The decisive farmer would not look ahead more than was necessary, often not as much as was necessary to plan most effectively but centred on doing thoroughly the task in hand. Thus decision was achieved by avoiding all possible occasions of indecision. This attitude for decision had a religious expression as follows: "The best way to find out God's will for to-morrow is to do to-day's task to-day."

Another intellectual attitude that was accentuated by the uncertainty

of the seasons was the reliance on one's own opinion, particularly on what one "happened to think." There was an inclination to think lightly of the value of scientific knowledge because certain knowledge seemed impossible in the face of the uncertainty of the seasons. So one man's opinion, provided he was a man of experience, seemed as good as another's. Hence the inclination to follow one's own ideas and to accord every man liberty to do the same. Men were cocksure but tolerant. "You happen to think that way—all right, I happen to think this way." A man might argue till doomsday but, in the last analysis, his ideas were what he happened to think—were his say-so as compared with somebody else's say-so. In these later years verified knowledge has won more respect. For the progress of scientific agriculture has enabled farmers in some degree to "get the best of the seasons." They can do this in two ways, first by reducing the uncertainty as far as possible to a reasonable risk,[7] and, second, by the cultivation of crops in such a way as to protect them from unfavourable weather.[8] So they have come to have more respect for scientific knowledge, as contrasted with their own opinions, than heretofore. However, the individualistic intellectual attitude is still strong among the rural population. It is due not only to the uncertainty of the farmer's life because of his dependence on the weather but also to his isolation and his constant action, which makes him averse to thought and discussion. Farmer boys have carried this individualistic attitude into business and the professions and the result is the proverbial American cocksureness.

The uncertainty of the seasons and of prosperity as dependent thereon supported the traditional religious belief in special providence. The religious attitude was to observe the ceremonies prescribed by ecclesiastics as a necessary condition of having the favour of God who ordered the seasons. These ceremonies included particularly keeping the Sabbath and going to meeting. Clergymen were asked by the church members to be "more earnest at the throne of grace that the seasons be ordered in mercy." To-day the superstition of special providence in connection with the seasons lingers in various rural parts of New York. But the more intelligent farmers everywhere believe the seasons are entirely determined by natural forces. The United States Weather Bureau has not only greatly aided agricultural operations and helped farmers to avoid losses that would have been enormous in the aggregate by its predictions of the weather, but also, by its attitude to the weather as something entirely due to natural

causes which can be understood and made the basis of predictions, it has done more than any one agency to weaken the belief in special providence. A farmer who reads an account of the work of the Weather Bureau [9] becomes acquainted with the scientific basis of predictions and learns the reasons for the frequent failures to predict correctly, which he had heretofore eagerly cited as proving that the scientific weather prophets "don't know it all."

The uncertainty of the seasons encouraged also the prevailing tendency to emotional thinking. The farmer was instinctively optimistic because we instinctively seek satisfaction rather than annoyance and, therefore, impulsively expect a pleasant rather than an unpleasant result. On the other hand the hard life with its weariness and never-ending work tended to make many a farmer feel that life was essentially evil. To convert this pessimism into the hopefulness that is a necessary stimulus to endeavour was the function of the religion of the time. Essential in the religion was the belief in a well disposed deity who could be depended on to help the farmer if he was industrious and did his part. Because of the prevailing conception of ideas as what somebody happened to think, no need was felt for a scientific verification of religious beliefs. Their ancient tradition and their wide acceptance were a sufficient sanction of them. And the fact that they did stimulate hopefulness was a still stronger sanction. In the absence of any pronounced attitude for inductive verification of ideas, the condition which most effectively conveyed an impression of their truth was that many people had long held them, were inspired by them and emphatically believed them to be true. The religious system, by stimulating hopefulness, stimulated industry. This complex religious attitude was accentuated by the uncertainty of the farmer's economic life. The development of scientific agriculture has diminished uncertainty, for scientific knowledge equips the farmer to cope with uncertainty to some extent. But the scientific attitude is still weak; the religious attitude persists.

Rural attitudes due in part to the uncertainty of the weather and the seasons were carried by boys reared on the farm into business and the professions. These attitudes, owing to the different conditions of business and the professions, were changed in the process of adjustment to new conditions. That is, the process was not one of transference for the attitudes were changed in the course of the transference; it was rather a transmutation.

The uncertainty of the seasons is not equally disturbing in all

agricultural industries. Fruit growing is more precarious than grain growing. We should expect attitudes connected with the uncertainty of the seasons to persist longer in the more, than in the less precarious industries. On the other hand, some of the more precarious require much more scientific knowledge and skill than the less precarious. Fruit growing is more uncertain than grain growing but it requires more scientific knowledge. Wherefore, even though their industry is more uncertain, fruit growers are apt to be farmers of unusual intelligence and alertness and less subject to the weather attitudes than grain farmers. In all agricultural industries, however, the farmer is more or less dependent on the weather and cannot escape the effect of this on his character.

The interest of the farmer in the seasons and in the weather from day to day, his exposure to the weather while he worked, the solitude in which he did much of his work, in short his dependence on nature and his life close to nature, disposed him to see in nature signs to guide him in his uncertainty. The mind finds uncertainty annoying for it interferes with action and adjustment, which is the normal state of an organism. It finds mystery perplexing for mystery means something to be explained and the mind is not at rest until satisfied with an explanation. Wherefore, in the presence of mystery the mind tends to swing to the stock explanations furnished by the culture of the group; and before uncertainty as to what is to be done it tends to follow rules of behaviour. The natural features most commonly used as signs in connection with the uncertainty of the weather were the colour of the sun, halos and coronas around the sun and moon, the colour and forms of the clouds, the appearance of the stars, the direction and strength of the wind, the course of smoke, the quality of sounds, the position of the leaves of the foliage and of the petals of flowers, the appearance of moss, the behaviour of farm animals, reptiles, flies, bees, ants, spiders, the flight and noises of birds, the appearance of the hills, whether or not there had been dew or frost on the previous night, and the position and phases of the moon. Some of these signs were purely fanciful, others were more or less trustworthy.[10]

Attitudes to the Moon

The most widely observed signs and proverbs related to the moon. The moon was of all natural objects the most interesting. One cannot look at the unclouded sun, and the sun does not have regular phases

as does the moon. Furthermore, the moon appears after the day's work is done when the mind is free to dwell on its various aspects. This is the time when the mind is anticipating the work of the morrow and, therefore, when associations of moon, weather and work are most apt to take place. How certain changes in the moon came to be relied on as rules of action we do not know and the farmer did not venture any explanation as to the origin of the rules though he attempted to justify his confidence in them. The most important rule was that certain agricultural operations should not be begun in "the ole of the moon," that is, during a waning moon. This rule was followed by the farmer in a great variety of operations. He would not plant anything in the "ole of the moon," would not trim his trees in the "ole of the moon," would not kill his hogs or tap his trees or set his hens in the "ole of the moon." He planted, killed, and tapped "in the moon" as he called it, that is, while the moon was waxing. Many farmers would do anything in the waning moon that did not involve the processes of growth for its fruition. But there were others who extended the rule to the killing of hogs, tapping of trees, beginning of haying and other operations which did not involve the processes of growth. When questioned as to the why of the rule the reason given might relate to the particular crop in connection with which it was invoked or it might not. Potatoes were not to be planted in the waning moon for they would all run to vines. Grain was not planted in the waning moon for it would all run to straw. Hogs were not killed in the waning moon for the pork would shrink in the pot. Trees were not tapped in the waning moon for it would shrink the run of sap. Some farmers seemed to think that as the moon was waxing so would the crops grow, and as the moon was waning to the point of disappearance so would the fruition of anything done in the waning moon. Other farmers would say, when questioned as to the reason for the rule, "What makes the tides, boy?" But neither this analogy of water raised by the moon with crops rising from the ground nor that of a waning moon with failing crops explains why the farmer followed the rule. He followed it unquestioningly because he had always done so, as had his fathers before him. If he seriously reflected why, the chief reason that came to his mind was that it had always been so.

The ole-of-the-moon superstition seems to have been universal in New York and to have been widespread in other states and in Europe. Possibly it dates back to ancient times when the moon was one of the

principal objects of worship. It is followed to this day in certain parts of New York. And farmers who no longer observe it continue to be interested in the moon. Most farmers are pretty apt to know just what phase the moon is in and when it will change. Obviously the regulation of operations according to the phases of the moon was a source of great inconvenience. For instance, if "a good spell of weather" came in the waning moon the farmer could not go ahead with his planting. Gradually the more sensible farmers broke away from the rule, greatly to the dislike of their neighbours. In one section during the waning moon a neighbour came in when a farmer was cutting up potatoes for planting. "Don't you plant in the moon?" asked the neighbour. "No, I plant in the ground" was the reply. Another farmer was less laconic, when, in reply to a similar question he said, "No, but we'll harvest in the moon." That is, he would get a good harvest even if he was planting in the waning moon.

This superstition as to the moon was carried over into other activities. In some parts certain religious festivals must not come in the waning moon.[11] It was an unpropitious time for going on a journey and for social functions.

The farmer had other signs in nature that served as rules to guide him in his work. For instance, one rule was that the time to plant beans is when the oak leaves are as large as squirrels' ears. This rule was not necessarily a safe guide for cold, rainy weather and even frost sometimes came after leaves were that size. But the farmer followed the rule unquestioningly, vehemently, as if it had some sacred efficacy. A father condemned his son, who had settled on an adjoining farm, in unmeasured terms because he did not get his beans in at that time. When, in the second and third periods, the rising generations came to disregard these rules, this was a source of a good deal of ill-feeling between them and the older generation.

The tendency to stick to irrelevant and inconvenient rules has persisted in agriculture as it has not in other occupations because of the farmer's interest in the seasons and also because of his isolation and independence. Factory workmen cannot adhere to rules that interfere with their work because they are under employers who regulate their movements. Manufacturers, merchants and professional men cannot adhere to such rules because they are in intimate relations with others and competition begets an inclination to rid oneself of everything that interferes with efficiency. But the farmer is not dependent on an employer and is not in intimate relations with other men in his

economic life. Left to himself he can persist in following traditional rules, and this is one reason for the slow development of scientific farming and of co-operative marketing. However, absorption in the process of work, mere industriousness in the conventional ways, is giving way to interest in the financial returns. And this interest is reacting on the process of work in a way to make it less subservient to ancient rules and more susceptible of changes in accordance with the growing scientific knowledge.

CHAPTER VI

TRADITIONAL FAMILY ATTITUDES

THE attitudes of the rural family in New York were determined by tradition and by the social and economic conditions of the New World. In the Old World there was comparatively little migration up to the nineteenth century. Young people courted, married, raised a family and grew to mature life under the eyes of the relatives on each side. The situation of the American family was somewhat different. It was more isolated. To be sure immigrants from England and Holland came in kinship groups or fragments thereof and settled in the New World in neighbourhoods the families of which were more or less related by ties of blood. When New Englanders migrated to New York, they often migrated in more or less related groups. However, as the population scattered from the eastern states westward over the national domain, there was an ever increasing separation from kindred. The result was that, in the New World, the family was less under the influence of outsiders than in the Old.

In the New World a newly married couple was more independent economically than in the Old, for it was easier to get land. And if a boy could not get the necessary capital to buy tools and animals to start as a farmer, it was easier to get a job on public works, as roads, canals and, later, railroads than in European nations where less extensive works were undertaken. So the young couple was more independent economically in the New World than in the Old. The development of modern industry and the growth of cities still further increased this independence.

Having indicated the difference between Old and New World conditions we have next to describe traditional family relations as they were received from the Old World. Then in succeeding chapters we shall describe the changes in traditional relations that resulted from the adaptation of families to the conditions of the New World.

There are two distinct lines of tradition that determined family

attitudes in the rural parts of New York in the first century after the Revolution. These were the traditions of the Dutch settlers and those of immigrants from New England.[1] The Dutch attitude of husband to wife was a somewhat less extreme form of masculine domination than that of New England.[2] As to relations of parents and children, parental authority was as pronounced among the Dutch as in New England. The difference in the attitude of husband to wife is said to have been due to the early predominance of trade in Holland, as compared with English landlordism which encouraged the traditional feudal subjection of woman to man.[3] This difference was perpetuated by differences in economic conditions in the New World. The "more genial spirit of Dutch Protestantism as contrasted with the harsh lines of British Calvinism" and "the better soil and less rigorous climate of the Hudson Valley contributed to make life smoother and more genial in New York than in New England."[4] The Dutch settlers penetrated beyond the Hudson Valley into the villages of central and western New York but rural New York was more largely settled by immigrants from England and New England than by the Dutch. English more than Dutch attitudes determined the civilization of New York. In a study of the traditional family relations of New York, we centre, then, on the English Puritans.

The New England family was essentially that of Puritan England. The English Puritans represented the developing middle class. This class had better homes than the lower classes and so emphasized family life as against the coarse social pleasures of lower classes. The Puritans were those who had risen out of the lower classes by superior thrift. Their thrift was one expression of their self-restraint. Another expression was sexual restraint.[5] The Puritans had large families but opposed licentiousness. Female chastity was more emphasized than male because more important for safeguarding legitimate inheritance.[6] The Puritan wife "obeyed her husband, calling him lord,"[7] and required strict obedience of her children. Parents selected husbands for their daughters and exerted a strong and often decisive influence in a son's choice of a wife. This situation was possible because of the strong attitude of filial obedience and also because of the importance of property considerations. For parents selecting mates for their children one of the most important considerations was what dowry the girl would get and what were the man's financial prospects. "Daughters were usually allowed at least the right of refusal but they do not seem to have been prone to make

objection. Mercenary marriages were in keeping with the nature of the hard-headed middle-class that took to Puritanism." [8]

The Puritans came to New England not as individual adventurers but as families. "It was because the hazards of life at home made it impossible to gather a competence for their children that the religious enthusiasts sought a settled habitation overseas." [9] In New England the property side of marriage was prominent.[10] Parents "contrived" profitable matches for their children and brought suit against young men who made love to their daughters contrary to their wishes.[11] But the wilderness life in the New World necessarily gave the young people more freedom than in the Old. For this reason the government of the New England community undertook to exercise a rigid censorship over family life.[12] It supported parents in their control of their children and it rigorously regulated the conduct of married people. However, parents were not permitted by the community to set the property standard so high as to prevent their children marrying readily. "In a new country, needing population, it was natural that pious authorities should frown upon any discouragement of legitimate increase. Appeal to a magistrate was in order in case of unreasonable opposition by those in charge of the young people." [13] Parents were entitled to secure the best match for their children but they must not be so particular as to prevent their marrying. The young must marry and once married they must live together.[14] On the whole, however, the matches of the young were arranged by the parents in New England as in the Old World. It was the parents' concern because questions of property figured so largely in marriage. This emphasis on the property side of marriage was bound to result in family pride and exclusiveness. Poorer families could not intermarry with the well-to-do. Family pride resulted in sumptuary laws forbidding the wearing of ornaments and ribbons to those assessed below a certain figure. The law exempted families of magistrates or "such whose quality and estate have been above the ordinary degree though now decayed." [15] "Family integrity reached beyond death. Much solicitude was felt by the New England people for the salvation of kindred. In many communities each family had a burying-place on the home-farm." [16] "In the rapid expansion of New England families there developed a tendency to the formation of patriarchal clans. Aubury noted the great number of half-finished houses. A man would build and occupy half of the structure. When his son married the new couple finished and moved into the other half." [17]

The authority of parents and the duty of filial obedience was backed by the kinsmen on both sides. Parents who were too severe or too lenient felt the adverse criticism of their relatives and of the community generally. As the boy grew up his attitude of obedience was modified by his growing importance. He was of much more importance than the girl, as the future head of a family and a property-owner. As such he had a right to consideration and careful instruction at the hands of his parents and a parent who evidently was not giving such instruction as to prepare his boy for his future responsibilities was condemned.

It is evident that this traditional type of family, in which the marriage group is tied up closely with the kinship groups on each side and with the community, can exist only among a settled agricultural population. Just as soon as families begin to migrate they pass beyond the influence of kinsmen and the community. This is precisely what happened to the American family. The attitudes of the Old World persisted in colonial New England because of the continual emigration from the Old World. However, with the opening up of the country after the Revolution and particularly after the War of 1812, families were more and more removed from the influence of kindred and this resulted in changes in family relations.

26064

CHAPTER VII

THE NEW CONDITIONS

THE settlers of New York had to hew their farms and their homes out of the primeval forest.[1] With a few tools and farm animals and a virile religion men and women applied themselves to a task that required extreme exertion and unfaltering resolution. William Cooper, father of James Fenimore Cooper, wrote in his *Guide in the Wilderness,* published in 1810, of conditions among settlers in New York: "If the poor man who comes to purchase land has a cow and a yoke of cattle to bring with him he is of the most fortunate class, but . . . he must do all his clearing with his own hands. Having no pasture for his cow and oxen, they must range the woods for subsistence; he must find his cow before he can have his breakfast, and his oxen before he can begin his work. Much of the day is sometimes wasted and his strength uselessly exhausted." [2] "The greatest discouragement was in the extreme poverty of the people, none of whom had the means of clearing more than a small spot in the midst of the thick and lofty woods, so that their grain grew chiefly in the shade; their maize did not ripen, their wheat was blasted, and the little they did gather they had no mill to grind within twenty miles distance. . . ." [3] Hardships like these had to be borne by the settlers generally. Similar experiences were repeated after the Civil War in the settlement of the country west of the Mississippi and pioneers of Iowa and Minnesota are still living to tell the tale.[4]

The settlement of the new country went on in waves, each new generation sending settlers further westward. This westward movement altered the traditional family relations. The regard for relatives continued but relatives were scattered, families were isolated. Families that migrated in groups became attached to one another regardless of whether they were related or not, because of the hardships they went through together. Hardships likewise increased the attachment between husband and wife. People came to prize one another for what they were personally, regardless of their family connections.

The wilderness finally gave place to fertile fields and comfortable

homesteads; prosperity succeeded the struggle and hardships of the pioneer period. This successful outcome of the great adventure gave the attitudes and beliefs of the pioneers a prestige and a sacredness, particularly their individualism, which has survived to the present time. A man's worth was to be judged on the basis of his manhood, not his family connections or his possessions. Women as well as men laid the emphasis there. The esteemed man was not only courageous but generous for it was not merely what a man could do for himself but what he was willing to do for you when you were in a "tight pinch." To be sure what he would do for you depended on what he could do—on his strength, his courage, his sagacity, but he might have all these qualities and still not put them at the disposal of his neighbours.

The zest for adventure of pioneer days survived among the settled farming population. But the routine life conduced to action according to custom. Agricultural methods were as they had been for generations. The conditions of the New World did not favour any change. The farmers were clearing the land and the power used was muscle. They were cultivating small fields, as their forefathers had done before them. They were producing primarily for their own consumption. The means of transport were very limited. The pioneering era had been, in some respects, favourable to change, for the pioneer had to be resourceful in order to maintain himself and his family in the wilds. But his precarious situation was unfavourable to mechanical inventions or carefully thought out changes in institutions. The frontier was favourable to impulsive variations from conventional behaviour, to indifference to law and to emotional religion.[5] But the routine life of the succeeding generations conduced to the restraint of impulse, which accentuated adherence to custom. This adherence was increased by the prestige of the mighty pioneer folk[6] to whom the customs were ascribed. The tendency to magnify "the way our fathers did" gave a sacredness to many ways to which the fathers had been quite indifferent.

Adherence to custom was due essentially to the isolation and the stress of work. The farmer and his family were up at day-break, in the fall and winter before. In the busy season he had the chores done, breakfast eaten and was in the field by six o'clock. The field work continued till six at night, with an hour off at noon. After supper came the evening chores. The work day extended from dawn

till twilight. Even when it was not the busy season the day was scarcely less strenuous. For the clearing of the land went on through decades and whenever the farm work "slacked up" the farmer went to work in the stump lot. This work of clearing went on all winter. A much greater quantity of fire wood was required than later because of the use of fireplaces. The settlers and their immediate descendants were men picked by nature for the great adventure; and they set a standard of industriousness which seems incredible to the farmer of to-day.

The women's work was not less strenuous than the men's.[7] On Monday the washing was out before seven, or nine at the latest, and, if the weather was favourable, was dried before noon and the ironing was well on to completion before night. Then came the weekly baking day. The baking was done in an outside brick oven under a shed or in an arched brick oven built into the chimney by the fireplace or in a tin baker placed before the open fire. Any of these arrangements necessitated skilled management of the wood fire, which increased the labour of baking. Every week day was about as busy as washing and baking day. In addition to the preparation of meals and other housework there was the spinning to do and the clothing to make and mend, the milk to skim, pans to wash and the cream to churn, water to carry, and, in the summer and fall, the canning and pickling, the making of lard and candles and soap. In addition to the housework the women in some parts did a good deal of work in fields.[8] The lot of the farmer's wife has somewhat improved with the progress of the agricultural and domestic arts but her life is still hard. And it is more difficult than formerly to get help at those times when it seems impossible to get along without it.[9] For the women of the neighbourhood help each other less than formerly and the development of modern industry has made it difficult to get hired help in the home.

The farmer was the leader of the family in the daily work. He ruled his family rigorously, in some cases harshly, priding himself on the amount of work his wife could do,[10] on her economy and efficient management, and on the amount he could "get out of" his boys. The strength of habit of the early days cannot be understood without constantly keeping in mind the necessity of long hours of hard work and of the director of the work keeping the family at it. Industrious habits are not in line with the impulses of the young and the father of the family was intent on keeping the family at work, that

they might not lose their industry. He himself had been so trained; he "never let up, himself," and his habit was to hold others to their work without any let up. This applied not only to economic habits but to all others. No child was allowed to lay off from work or to indulge himself in any other way or to stay home from church. Every habit was as important as every other in the sense that a letting down in any one would encourage a general letting down. There was always this sense of the opposition between the customs of the community and the impulses of the "natural man." The minister was constantly warning against "a letting down" in morals and he echoed the feeling of the austere parent. Thus the customs of the community had a fixity that reflected the fixity of the attitudes of the man of action before the stern demands made on him by his economic situation.

In the last analysis the austerity of parents in the rearing of children sprang from economic necessity. It was in the economic field that the father's rule was most rigorous. In religious observances he was more lenient than the wife. Often he would have been a little lenient in the matter of going to church on a cold, stormy day but for the insistence of his wife. He was out-of-doors six days in the week and she was inside. Then, too, she was apt to have a more serious religious interest than he and to be more uncompromising about church attendance. His rigour was particularly noticeable in the economic sphere and explains much that to the casual observer seems hard and arbitrary. For instance, a father told a son if he would do his stent of work in the forenoon he would let him off in the afternoon to go hunting. The boy did his work but was compelled to work all the afternoon. Under a generous impulse the father made the promise and then the old fear that a little leeway would unsettle the boy's habits impelled him to deny the half day of freedom that he had promised. When work became slack between hoeing and harvest, rather than let up for a day the farmer would set his boys to picking up stone. The farmer always took the lead in this strenuous life. As he gave his boys a stent of work for the day, so he gave himself one. And he was by no means more generous with himself than with them. The boys might fear him and dislike the monotony of the strenuous life, but they respected him. His power of discipline required that he never ask them to do what he would not do himself. They respected his efficiency and firmness, his stoical endurance and impartial fairness. The more thoughtful of them felt that it was for

OHIO WESLEYAN LIBRARY UNIVERSITY

their good, that when they became of age they would be free, and that he would give them a start in life.

Action was, therefore, the essential characteristic of the early days. In a society in which life opportunities were very limited, in which men were pressed into agriculture whether they would or no, there were inevitably many whose capacities better fitted them for something else. But stern necessity demanded incessant action and this required a rigorous inhibition of impulses to the contrary. Hence the extreme power of endurance and self-denial that marked the early rural character. Hence, also, the eminently practical trend of the intellectual life. "Make your head save your heels" was the maxim. Later, the development of education as a means of acquiring prestige emphasized the divorce of thinking from practice. Thus could the members of a leisure class display their distinctness from those who used their intellect chiefly in connection with their work.

The strong action of the rural population gave people insistent impulses and the resulting tendency to wilfulness had to be met by a correspondingly strong power of self-restraint. Self-restraint was developed in children by firm parental discipline. Thus the child learned to restrain himself. But there was apt to be a good deal of wilful behaviour, particularly in vigorous boys, before the lesson was learned. So the belief came to be widely held that it is inevitable that boys should be more or less wilful and sow their wild oats before they settle down. The belief was due to the fact that the strenuous life strengthened impulsiveness and at the same time repressed a boy's natural impulses, thus increasing the inclination to wild oats. But stern necessity, when he became of age, required that he settle down and temptations not to do so were far less distracting than to-day. To-day, there is less inclination to wild oats from repressed impulses, more from the pampering of children, and the parents of the pampered child often continue the indulgence after he grows up so that the wild-oats habits can be adhered to. He can drift along in an easy job and live a more or less dissipated life until he comes to feel he has gone too far really to make anything of himself.

The individualism of the pioneer period therefore gradually underwent a change. While retaining the personal traits that are required to meet a crisis, it came to involve, also, those that make a man a successful farmer. It got its meaning more and more from the traits of the successful farmer, less from those of the pioneer. Thus American individualism has had a different meaning in different pe-

riods, but in all periods has derived its meaning from the men of prestige of the period, first from the pioneers, then from the successful farmers. Later the men who put through the great transportation and other enterprises on which the material development of the country depended gave a new turn to the ideal of individualism. Its meaning changed as one class of men of prestige succeeded another, though certain traits were characteristic of individualism throughout.

CHAPTER VIII

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE SEXES

FAMILY relations under the new conditions were determined by tradition modified by the individualism of the pioneer period and later by that of the successful farmer. In the Old World the Puritan had numerous children and this was the custom in colonial New England and New York and in New York after the Revolution.[1] The large families were due to the very early marriages and to the traditional submission of the wife to masculine domination. The domination of the husband was endorsed by custom. It was the custom to have large families. They were a source of pride. They were endorsed by the church. The church regarded the purpose of marriage as to have children, and the people concurred. Some religious sects encouraged large families as a means of increasing members of the sect.[2] There was somewhat more reason for having large families in those days than to-day[3] in that the more grown-up boys the farmer had the more land he could clear and till. Then too, a goodly number of stalwart sons gave a sense of security against the Indian and also against other families in communities where hostility and encounters between families were not uncommon.[4] Also, the isolation of the farmer's family made the companionship of a large family satisfying.[5] However, families often were larger than there was any conceivable reason for their being. The years when children were small were hard years. "But they'll soon be old enough to help," was the parent's thought, and children were put to work early.[6] However, owing to the custom of early marriage, the years during which the farmer had the labour of a grown-up son or daughter were few. Particularly did the numerous children burden the mother, and this burden added one more hardship to a life of toil, and with other conditions served to give life that background of weariness and restraint under exacting tasks that developed the attitude, "Life is a battle." These hardships made religion a vital thing in the lives of the people. Their abnormal life made

necessary a religion that would enable them to maintain a normal peace of mind.

American individualism did not, then, relieve the mother of the burden of a large family but rather increased it. In the Old World rural life encouraged large families but there was a sentiment against an excessive number of children for the land was limited and too many diminished the life opportunities of all. This caused a sentiment among the relatives on both sides against very large families. But in America the isolated family set its own standard and the parents were proud of their numerous progeny, which ran wild in the wilderness, married early and scattered over the national domain. Because of the abundance of cheap land, numerous children did not necessitate a too minute division of the ancestral estate.

Sexual Morality

Sexual morality seems to have been more austerely regarded in the rural districts in the early days than to-day; immorality was much more harshly condemned. This was due to a variety of causes. First, economic conditions were favourable to chastity in that these made possible early marriage and this with a life of toil and isolation tended to confine sexual relations to those sanctioned by marriage. Second, after the colonial period with its emphasis on property considerations had passed, there were no social or economic bars to free choice in marriage, wherefore there was felt to be little excuse for sexual immorality. A man was free to marry the girl of his choice, if he could win her, and she was free to accept or reject a suitor. Another reason for the intense feeling against immorality was sexual jealousy. Where there was comparatively free choice and people married for love, sexual jealousy was intense. Women approved of the jealousy of their husbands for it testified to their hold on their men. So married men and women tended to be strictly moral. Lovers were jealous of the attentions of other suitors to their sweethearts and the custom obtained of asking a girl for "her company" which meant that, for a reasonable period, she would not "go with" any other fellow and the fellow would not go with any other girl. A girl who encouraged several fellows was socially disapproved as a flirt. Girls felt this social restraint of too free behaviour on their part, which discouraged immorality. Still another reason for the intense social abhorrence of immorality was the intense regard for family honour.

The father and brothers of a wronged girl were apt to take vengeance, which made seduction dangerous business. Also the absence of class distinctions favoured chastity. "In Europe the victims of lordly lust were chosen from classes that could not secure redress, while in America justice was perhaps less biased." [7] With the rise of class distinctions in the second period of rural development and the angling of a girl and her parents for a rich young farmer, her family had less reason to feel outraged if she was seduced by him; consequently public opinion was not so strong against seduction as in the earlier period. Another reason for the sentiment against immorality was that the family was more or less isolated and the members were under the constant surveillance of the father; he and his family were under the eye of the neighbourhood and of the brethren and sisters of the church to which the family belonged. Hence there was no possibility of secret immorality, as to-day in cities. Another reason was that immorality was a sin and no sin escaped God's all-seeing eye, which was a powerful deterrent in those days when the fear of committing sin was so pronounced.

The intense disapproval of sexual immorality caused, among people of ultra-respectable feelings, a timidity about anything superficially associated with sex. Women were extremely modest. The jealousy of husbands was an incentive to wives to appear modest and daughters acquired this attitude from their mothers. The modesty of women often approached prudery. But prudery was, at first, more conspicuous in the villages and cities than on the farms. The farmer was raising all kinds of animals and the various operations in this connection were referred to in the family as a part of the day's work. With the growth of cities and the mingling of men and women in work and recreation there developed those informal social relations between the sexes that resulted in the passing of prudery. The increasingly free manners of city women were regarded by the more modest country women as immodest. Eventually these city manners, like city ways generally, began to influence the country.

Relations Between Husband and Wife

The traditional relation of husband and wife was one of respect rather than affection. The respect was expressed according to the customs of the group. Respect required that the wife obey and be faithful to her husband, care for his comfort and defer to him. He must

be faithful to her and provide for her and treat her "well." [8] Religion emphasized the subjection of the wife to the authority of the husband. So did the law. The husband had a legal right to the person of his wife. She could not leave him unless permitted by the court, because of behaviour of the husband that constituted ill treatment in the eyes of the court. Her parents could not support or protect her unless the court had given her permission to leave her husband. "The wife had no right to the custody of her person or of her children. The husband could apprentice the children at an early age against her will and at his death could dispose of the children by will even though they were unborn. The formula constantly used in legal decisions was 'the wife is dead in law' or 'Husband and wife are one and that one the husband.' " [9] However, the subjection of wives was not quite so abject as that implied in the law and the theology of the time. The situation was much the same as that evident recently in the movement to eliminate from the marriage ceremony the wife's promise to obey. In the ceremony she promises to obey but that does not necessarily represent the wife's attitude to her future husband. So in those days some of the law and the theology on family relations was a dead letter, though not by any means was there any opposition to the use of the word obedience in the marriage ceremony. It represented the woman's attitude to her future husband. It was Scriptural. There was a general tendency literally to apply Scripture to family relations. For instance, women were not expected to speak in religious meetings and St. Paul's injunction to them to be silent in meeting was cited as authority.

This traditional relation which obtained in colonial New York was not seriously challenged in the period of pioneering that followed the Revolution. The pioneer individualism on the whole maintained the traditional subjection of woman. "In the new world a woman without a man was so helpless, having no protection against frontier perils and small opportunity for procuring a satisfactory livelihood, and civic life was still so obviously a man's world with its crudeness and fighting, that woman still ranked as a dependent on man. . . ." [10] However, the help that woman rendered man in taming the wilderness tended in some ways to make her more his companion than in the traditional relation. "The elevation that came in the status of woman was earned by devotion, labour, courage, self-control, heroism. . . . Women stood by their husband's side and fought for life and little ones against human and other foes." [11] Nevertheless, she was still subject to man.

His gratitude for devotion might make him generous, as employers of labour may be generous toward unusually good workmen. But in both cases the relation remains the customary one of subjection to authority.

The individualism of the farmer, also, tended toward maintenance of the traditional relation. But here, also, economic conditions alleviated somewhat the traditional subjection. The American farm was a place of enterprise, not a place where a peasant eked out a customary subsistence, as in the Old World. The qualities prized in a wife, in addition to sexual attractions, were capacity to work and willingness to take responsibility. A man wanted a wife who would submit when he required it, but he did not want a merely submissive woman. He wanted one who would shoulder the heavy responsibilities of the mother of a large family and of a partner in an economic enterprise. So the exigencies of the economic situation inclined the husband to forego exercise of authority that repressed initiative and willingness to work on the part of the wife. A man who lacked initiative sometimes depended on that of his wife. One man who was proverbially slow and procrastinating habitually depended on his energetic wife for suggestions to action. For instance, on a stormy spring day when he could not plow he stood deliberating and finally remarked, "I guess I'll go over to Rob's and get some seed." "Yes, I would," his wife replied. "Yes, I would" was the formula on which he had come to depend. A wife had to be tactful about taking the initiative in her husband's affairs just as he would hesitate to volunteer suggestions in the affairs of the household. Each had his and her own sphere of action. But, whenever a husband was slow and a wife energetic, she was apt to take an active interest in his movements.

The usual situation was that in which the husband and father was absorbed in work and expected wife and children to respect his attitude and show a like industry. He thought of his children as workers while his wife was more apt to think of them as children. In one such family the mother sometimes would go out into the field in the middle of the forenoon to get a younger and weaker boy whom she knew was by that time getting tired but who would not give up. "I want you to help me, John," she would say, thus shielding him from the father's wrath at her interference and from the shame of the suggestion that he rest awhile, a suggestion which, of course, he would have spurned. One of the essential causes of conflicts between husband and wife

was his absorption in work to the exclusion of the more human considerations which moved her.

In spite of the alleviating effect of woman's greater economic importance in the New World family, therefore, her economic subjection continued. So did her sexual subjection. In sexual relations the husband customarily had the decision. That is, he had the "rights of husband." Marriage was commonly regarded as the arrangement that made sexual intercourse moral and right and not only a right but a duty. For it was a duty to have children. The Bible commanded it. Hence sexual intercourse was a duty on the part of both husband and wife. It was assumed that the initiative belonged to the husband and that prudential considerations were incompatible with it. However, it by no means follows that the husband felt justified in indulgence to the point of physical and moral deterioration. But marriage gave him the decision and he consulted primarily his own well-being as he conceived it. The morality of this attitude was not seriously called in question by the wife. Marriage was thought of as sanctifying these sexual relations, though it was not clear "just what the preacher did that made the wrongest thing in the world the rightest thing in the world." [12]

The first woman's rights convention was held at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848, but its declarations against the various forms of the subjection of women were condemned throughout the state,[13] by women as well as by men. Until the second half of the nineteenth century the law gave the husband the custody of his wife's person, the exclusive control and guardianship of their children, the sole ownership of her personal and use of her real estate, and a right to her earnings. The keenness of the sense of the injustice of this relation was dulled by its being the customary relation. In most cases, perhaps, the women acquiesced without any sense of injustice at all.[14] Since then, through the agitation of a few men who gave their lives to getting justice for the weaker sex, and through the efforts of a few women, the wife has won the place of a free individual before the law.

We have, then, this situation: because of the peculiar economic conditions of the New World, the subjection of woman was alleviated in a way to encourage her to exercise initiative and to take responsibility; but she was still dependent on man. Conditions "impelled woman to marry, irrespective of love, as an alternative to a rather impersonal and perhaps menial existence in the home of parent or other relative; while, on the other hand, even in cities, facilities for com-

fortable bachelorhood were not great in the early days, and in the wilderness a wife was valuable for her labour, her companionship, and as the presumptive mother of numerous sturdy workers." [15]

Women were reminded of their inferiority while still girls. The boys were the important sex because they were the future heads of families.[16] Boys avoided any work that was women's work and any behaviour that was like that of girls. In their behaviour toward girls they showed a good-natured sense of superiority. The girl "toiled in domestic obscurity to educate the boys. The boy past twenty-one was free but the girl continued to work without wages after twenty-one as before. Marriage transferred her services to the husband. Food, shelter, and clothing were considered adequate reward." [17]

It is easy for one committed to the doctrine of the equality of the sexes to exaggerate the discontent of the women of those days in their subjection. Their behaviour was regulated by custom and the fact that subjection was customary mollified its annoyance. Though affection was not emphasized, there was more opportunity for affection between husband and wife in American than in European nations, in which they were under the surveillance of the two groups of kinsmen to which they belonged. Then again, husband and wife worked together in the enterprise of rearing a family and accumulating a competence. The sense of having a helpmate endeared her to him after youth and beauty had passed away. The farmer was helpless without his wife. This, with the isolation of the couple, favoured the traditional conception of marriage as one permanent union. The stern discipline of the environment, the necessity of constant work repressed in men and women illicit sexual impulses and fancies and impressed each with a sense of the other's loyalty as a helpmate.

In a sense the free American farmer was not free. He was not under a boss in his work. But nature imposed the stern necessity of work, and as the farmer was under the stern hand of nature so his family was under his stern hand. They understood the necessity that lay upon him. Their immediate subjection to him was ultimately a joint subjection of all to the necessities of their situation. Nevertheless his rule often was more harsh than was required by the situation. As we have seen he laid upon his wife the burden of a large family that was wholly unnecessary. And he tended to excuse any impulsive domination on his part as necessary for the welfare of the family.

The subjection of the wife involved annoyance, whatever her disposition. If she was submissive this encouraged domination on his part. If she was proud, there was constant friction. Her station in life was practically determined by that of her husband. If he amounted to something in the community, as a recognized property owner or public official, her position was thereby enhanced. Whatever her own personal qualities she was something or nothing according to his competency. To be sure, a competent wife could stimulate an incompetent man but this did not get him very far. Consequently the subjection of a competent woman to an incompetent man was exasperating and resulted in a good deal of nagging, just as the relation of competent workmen to an incompetent foreman exasperates the workmen and causes bitter comments on their part. The close economic relation of husband and wife made his incompetency evident to her as it would not have been later under the conditions of modern industry in which the man's working life is unknown to his wife. Under modern conditions the wife, like the husband, can have an economic career and is, therefore, less inclined to nag an incompetent husband.

The subjection of the wife reacted on her relation to her children. It "tended to make the boys overbearing, while the girls and mother were likely to be subdued with a sense of 'woman's place' " that prevented the full expansion of their personalities.[18] This subdued attitude weakened women's mental initiative, and made them conservative and less capable of inspiring children with a zest for personal development than they would have been in a more wholesome atmosphere. The woman of ideals strove to see her suppressed longings satisfied by winning opportunities for the education of an unusual son.

The attitudes of authority and subjection have been essential in the relation between male and female from the beginning.[19] The superior strength of the male has given him sexual domination and economic control. Tradition and the existing conditions have made the wife dependent on the husband. This relation being taken for granted, in the rural community, neither could use reason to any extent in settling their problems, for the essential attitudes on both sides were accepted without reasoning. They were assumptions that neither would challenge; they had developed out of past conditions which were not understood and they were accepted as inevitable. Consequently the thinking of the wife who was not contented with her subjection consisted, not in challenging the relation itself but in in-

voking sympathy in this or that painful situation of subjection. Her subjection made her skilful in appealing to the feelings of the members of the family in a way to enlist them against one who was "bearing on pretty hard" at the time. As to desires which she tried to realize in this way, they were not necessarily reasonable, but were in accord with her attitudes and impulses. The essentially irrational relation to her husband narrowly circumscribed her capacity to be reasonable and sensible in her desires and in her views of the problems that arose in the family. The husband's mental attitude was much the same. Like that of his wife it was a product of the traditional relation. Furthermore, his attitude of authority prompted him to act without thinking. Consequently the husband's treatment of his wife consisted largely in invoking feelings in her that would incline her to do as he wanted to have her do. In this he was aided by the fact that the family ways of doing were, for the most part, such as suited him rather than her; and, if necessary, he could determine things by a mere exercise of authority. The family ways were largely man-made ways and so he could rely on the tendency to adhere to custom and routine for things to go about as he would have them.

As husband and wife grew older and strength of impulse waned and the necessity of the strenuous life diminished, the tendency was for these changes to strengthen the bond between them. Each was more exclusively in the society of the other than heretofore, for the children had mostly left home, and each was less absorbed in the things of this life, nearer the great unknown and more centred on religion. Thus the attitudes of authority and subjection receded into the background. The loneliness, the weakness of age and the uncertainty of life made each cling to the other; and authority now came to rest more with the one who was personally the stronger, though long habit perpetuated deference to the man.

CHAPTER IX

THE RELATIONS OF PARENTS AND CHILDREN

THE traditional relation between parents and children was one of parental authority and filial obedience. This relation was brought from the Old World [1] by the parents who emigrated therefrom and was enmeshed in the religious doctrine and the law of the time. As we have seen, the children were legally under the authority of the father and he could dispose of them in the ways permitted by law. Religion supported this extreme paternal authority.[2] However, the control actually exercised was not as despotic as that reflected in the law and dogma of the time.[3] With the westward migration from New England, conditions tended to mollify the extreme traditional authority. New Englanders came into contact with groups in which the attitude to children was less despotic, so that the community made up of these various groups would not support as rigorous a control of children as did the New England community. In New York, "slighter attention was given than in New England to the regulation of domestic life. . . . Diversity of population and multiplicity of minor sects tended to clannishness but forced broad tolerance inasmuch as it was hard for any one group to gain unrestrained expression in the form of law." [4] Another cause of the change in attitude to children resulting from the western migration was that it isolated families. Isolation favoured an arbitrary parent as long as the children were small. But as they grew up, the father found it more difficult to maintain his authority. Furthermore, isolation inclined parents to make companions of their children. And the father had to have his children take certain responsibilities, which increased his respect for them. On the whole, then, American individualism diminished the subjection of children.

The isolation of the family, though it diminished the despotic aspect of the father's authority, centred the attention of the children on that authority. There was no competing influence. Furthermore, the parental control united in itself several lines of influence. The parents were the directors of the daily work in which all participated.

And the family was not only an economic but also an educational organization. Until the establishment of the common school system, children got their education in the home, unless the father was sufficiently well-to-do to send his children to a "select school." Even if they were sent to school, still the important training was the vocational and the training in character acquired in the course of work with the parents. The parents were also instructors in religion. To-day education is thought of as entirely the work of the school. Religious instruction is entrusted to the church. And children are relieved from as much work in the home and on the farm as possible that it may not interfere with their studies. Thus the authority and influence of the parents is reduced to a minimum.

Not only in economic activity, education and religious instruction were children centred on the parents' influence; they were constantly exhorted to do and think as their parents did and thought. The father and mother made it a point to agree in all their beliefs, as well as in all requirements of the children, in order that the parental authority might not be weakened by disagreement. The wife was apt to yield to the husband in cases of a difference of opinion, not only because it was customary for the wife to yield to her husband, but also in order to set an example that would strengthen the father's authority over his children. The examples of headstrong and wayward boys in every neighbourhood warned mothers that no sacrifice was too great to safeguard the father's authority. In short, it was generally recognized that "a man must be boss in his own family."

Parental authority was rigorously enforced. There was a pronounced tendency toward wilfulness among boys, due to the fact that the settlers were the venturesome men and women who emigrated from New England or Europe and left the less daring behind; and their children inherited their assertiveness. This wilfulness was a challenge to parents. The wrath of the father at disobedience was something that no child could stand against. Corporal punishment was severe and no neighbour thought of interfering though the father might seem beside himself. Usually his severity was deliberate. Children knew what was coming and besought the intercession of the mother. Sometimes, however, fathers were easy-going and the mother had to do the punishing or see that the father did it.

We must recognize also the part played by the community in the rearing of children. While many families lived isolated lives, most of

them had neighbours. Now the farmer was mindful that his authority depended not only on how he handled his children but also on how his neighbours brought up theirs. A general tendency to rigour encouraged each parent in his inclination toward rigour. Furthermore, the wisdom of the most successful in the rearing of their children became common property. The church also played a part in child-training. The minister declared from the pulpit the accumulated wisdom on this subject, with a background of Scriptural texts and interpretation.

Parental authority and filial obedience was the traditional relation but recent years have shown that this relation is quite apt to weaken when social and economic conditions become unfavourable to it. Its strong support in the early days was the economic position of the father. He directed the work of their joint agricultural enterprise and the attitude of obedience to him developed naturally in the course of work. The father realized the economic basis of his authority and kept at work as late in life as he could. When he was no longer able to work the habit of filial obedience remained but sometimes "the old man" was referred to in a voice of mingled pity and indifference. However, generally the aged commanded great respect and exerted a good deal of influence. In some sections to this day if the grandfather is a guest in the house the grandchildren are not allowed to sit down to the table, even though there are empty chairs, until the grandfather has eaten and left the table. If a grandchild objects to this the grandfather is mortally offended. This respect for grandparents in many cases seems to be not merely a social attitude but a custom consciously fostered by parents with the feeling that as they show respect for their parents so their children will be influenced to respect them. In communities where respect for aged parents is strong this attitude is transferred to old people generally. In one community if an old man who does not smoke enters the room, the smokers will put away their pipes, though they would not do so for a woman. An old woman exacts a ready obedience to her whims, which people not acquainted with this aspect of rural customs cannot understand. Among the agricultural populations of Europe also there is respect for old people as such;[5] but often when the old man is no longer able to compel respect as director of the work, the next generation are eager to have him out of the way.[6] In America he was more considerately treated than in Europe, where the cramped quarters of the family and their poverty made his querulous voice and the care of

him annoying. In eastern countries where the old man's religious significance as priest of the ancestral rights and near-ancester still continues, he comes in for great respect.

The children early learned to "take responsibility." It was because they had it thrust upon them. The wife who would shield a favourite son was reminded by the father that the boy must learn to take responsibility. If he was to play the part of a responsible man when he grew up he must be held accountable for the performance of the tasks required by his parents. It was this economic relation that made the early parental authority and filial obedience more pronounced than later. Then and later there was the dependence of the child on the parent for support—a natural basis of obedience to authority. But later the association of children in work with their parents, in the rural districts, diminished and, in villages, largely ceased. And there developed the tendency of fond parents to indulge and pamper their children, to be proud of them as assets in family rivalry; and the children were not long in learning how far they could go, as objects of parental devotion and pride, in having their own way. It is difficult to train children to take responsibility if the parent has no worth while tasks to hold them responsible for. For this reason the education of children should include intervals of earning their own living.[7]

Not only the economic but also the political conditions of early America favoured a less despotic attitude toward children than the traditional one. "Many observers, commenting on the freedom allowed to children in the new nation, attributed it to the spirit of republicanism. The decay of patriarchism is a natural corollary of political democracy; for the government recognizes, not families, but individuals. The father counts no more as a citizen than does his grown son and the lingering of paternal authority beyond the majority of the son would be incongruous."[8] However, the economic conditions were the essential ones. The political were given as a justification of requiring children to take responsibility; that is, it was said that, in a country where children become free on attaining their majority, a child must be made to realize that his freedom requires a corresponding sense of responsibility. But the requirement of responsibility was really due to the economic conditions. As economic conditions changed and families became prosperous, children were less and less required to take responsibility. But the political situation did not change. The making of citizens still required that they take responsi-

bility. But economic conditions so changed that this was not done; so the economic conditions were essential.

One set of conditions that affected the relation of parents and children had to do with working. The father directed the work of the children; the children felt a due responsibility for their performance of their share of the work under the direction of the father. A second set had to do with the accumulation of the wealth that resulted from their united efforts. The parents planned to give each child a certain part of the family accumulation when the child married and started in life. Parents desired their children to start with a certain standard of living and not to be a disgrace to them. Many fathers and mothers laboured that their children's lot might be, if possible, somewhat easier than their own had been.[9] On the death of the parents the property was divided among the children. The justification of inheritance conventionally given was that children are entitled to inherit what they have helped to create. This justification obviously has no weight in the case of village and city dwellers, where children do nothing to help their parents accumulate.

Parental authority and filial obedience naturally resulted in parents taking quite a positive interest in their children's love affairs and in children deferring to their parents more or less in this vital matter. The interest of parents was due not only to their solicitude for the welfare of a child in a matter that so vitally affected its welfare, but also to a feeling that the parent had a property right to a voice in the matter, inasmuch as the child's spouse, as well as the child, would ultimately share in the parent's property. The father, particularly, wanted to feel right as to the deserts of those who would share with his children the fruits of his long years of toil. Hence the father's disappointment at his son's marrying a "flighty" girl or a "sickly" girl or at his daughter's marrying "a good-for-nothing fellow." Marriage failures were more painful to the parents in the early days than later because the couple less frequently went to some distant city where the son or daughter could conceal his or her family troubles. Married children were apt to settle near by and to be more or less intimately associated with their parents. When, later, children left home when young to earn their living in the city, they felt more independent. They became intimate with young people whom the parents did not know and about whom they were, therefore, less competent to have an opinion than about young people in the home region.

The situation of the early family gave the members a strong sense

of need of each other's protection. Because of the isolation they were dependent on one another for companionship. Then too, when the children were old enough to marry, starting in life was not, as it is for many to-day, a matter merely of getting a job in some city and renting two or three rooms to live in. In those days it was apt to mean getting a farm or setting up in business, for which the help of the parents was required. As children felt a need of the help of their parents, so parents felt a need of their children's help. When the farmer or his wife died, if there was no son or daughter at home one of the married sons or daughters moved on to the old homestead, to make a home for the surviving one. Or when the farmer and his wife wanted to lay down the burdens of active life a married son came with his family and lived with the old people or in a separate part of the house. Or the old couple might go to live in the village. It was generally understood that, as a rule, "no house is big enough for two families."

This dependence of parents on children intensified their affection for their children. Although farmers' sons were ambitious to migrate to where they "could do the best," and although this ambition was encouraged by parents, and although daughters were brought up to feel they must go with their husbands wherever they could do the best, yet there was a contrary tendency. Parents were apt to be secretly glad when children decided to settle near by, and they often attempted to dissuade a son from "going west" and promised to "do well by him" if he settled near by.

The dependence of parents on children was never admitted by the parents. The father, especially, was apt to treat his grown-up son in a very casual and indifferent way.[10] Because parents were enterprising workers and aggressive directors of work and because of the attitude of independence of the American farmer, there was one thing he could not stand and that was to feel dependent on his children. If the aged parents had property income sufficient to maintain them, they felt independent fundamentally, even if they were not able to live alone. And an economically independent man or woman was more apt to have the respect of, and to be considerately treated by a son-in-law or a daughter-in-law than one whose existence was "a drain on the family income."

Grown-up children were apt to have an attitude of independence of their parents. This was due to their training. The boy wanted to show his father that he could make good as an independent farmer,

for the father had held before his sons from their earliest years the fact that some day they must shift for themselves. That, he maintained, was the reason for his rigorous discipline. So self-reliance became to a boy the essential attitude of manhood. As a boy, he was constantly priding himself on the things he could do alone; and he was exasperated when anybody tried to help him lift a load or perform a task that taxed his strength. As he grew up he was more and more apt to differ with his father on the way things should be done. Self-reliance tends to develop mental initiative. Finally he came to manhood and was eager to demonstrate the supreme proof of manhood—that he could support himself and wife independently. Another cause of the independence of the young farmer was the attitude of his wife to her husband's parents. The wife was more apt to be jealous of her husband's family than he of his wife's family, because, in spite of her family, the husband was traditionally boss of his wife, whereas she was subservient to him and did not want her subservience increased by his parents' attitude of authority over her directly, or indirectly through their influence over him. She was quite apt to imagine that her husband's parents assumed the right to an undue exercise of authority. Because the wife was not traditionally boss of her husband but he of her, so that she had to control him by influence, she was more jealous of a contrary influence over him than he of one over her. Wherefore, the wife's influence was apt to be in the direction of living at some distance from his family and being independent of them.[11]

The isolation of the rural family deepened the attachment of husband and wife, also of parents and children. There was little that was unfamiliar, and so there developed a deep attachment for the familiar scenes and, particularly, for the familiar faces. People were very apt to be homesick away from home. Newly married girls, in the isolation of the new home yearned for the parental roof.

When a boy left home he for the first time became conscious of the family solidarity; and the tendency was to express in letters the loyalty and the longing for the familiar faces. Often this was prompted also by an impulse to make those at home realize that, while they could not appreciate the ambitions that impelled him to leave home, and could not understand why he stayed away so long without making them a visit, he was as loyal as any of the children. Too prolonged a stay tended to weaken the family's belief in the loyalty of the absent one.

Because of the sense of family solidarity there was an emphasis on the necessity of agreement between all the members.[12] Ordinarily this was not difficult to secure because, on account of filial obedience and the isolation of the family, the children were apt to differ little from the parents in essential beliefs. Children derived their religious, political and other beliefs about as they did their table manners. Thus the differences in beliefs that divide families to-day were less in evidence. However, when there was a difference in religious beliefs it was more serious than to-day because of the greater seriousness that attached to religion. Not only in essential beliefs but especially in the day's plans, the economic solidarity of the family called for agreement. When the family became less of an economic unit, when less work was required of the children and they were being educated in the village school "to be something beside farmers," they were accorded greater freedom to have their own opinions. The tendency was for the child to feel at variance with its parents in connection with certain beliefs and ways of doing and possibly to "look down on" them a little.[13]

The attitudes that determined family relations entered into the determination of community relations. For instance, honour, that is, "always do what you say you'll do" was an attitude inculcated in children by parents. Children observed this attitude in their family relations and, when they grew up, it was transferred to community relations. Honour in the community meant "Your word as good as your note." In the discipline of his children the father observed this attitude. He laid down the law and then "stood by his word" and punished any child who disobeyed. He punished in spite of extenuating circumstances because "unless I do as I say I will my children won't respect me." In like manner the local justice emphasized certainty of punishment according to the letter of the law. He followed the legal doctrine that it was more important that the law should be certain than that it should be just.

One reason for the respect for law of the early neighbourhood was the child's respect for the father's word. This attitude of respect for parental law was transferred to the law of the community when the child grew up. The law of the community was not an impersonal thing for it was thought of as sanctioned by God. The morality of the community, like the law, had this personal sanction. As one man put it, "My religion is not my conscience but what lies back of my conscience."

This respect for law was not at all inconsistent with the tendency to "law it" for, as the child ran to enlist the parental authority against a tormenting brother, so the impulse of the grown man was to "have the law on" a high-handed neighbour. A man who won a lawsuit declared, "I tell you the law is a great thing." It was a great thing because of the universal respect for it and the certainty with which the citizen could rely on it to protect his rights. If ever a farmer seemed too strong for the law and managed by his influence to escape its strong arm, the aggrieved party declared that a just God would one day punish him.

Children seem to have somewhat less respect for their parents than formerly. One reason is that parents have become less directors in work and correctors of behaviour and are more indulgent. And adults have less respect for the law than formerly. It is because "the child is father of the man." Family attitudes are transmuted into community behaviour. The indulged child becomes the self-indulgent man and, in his insistence on self-indulgence that is forbidden by the law, he is impatient with the legal restraint. This tendency is aggravated by the influence of the crowd, or, as we say, the trend of the times. When the practice of indulging children is spreading, the discipline of children becomes more difficult. And when the violation of law by these grown-up children is widely prevalent, who will enforce the law, since law enforcement in a democracy depends on "public sentiment"?

The attitude of the children themselves played no small part in maintaining the parents' authority. Children would repeat the comments made by the parents about the behaviour of one of their number. A mother would criticize a child's stubbornness and the other children would take it up. It must be remembered that, in those days, children were more in the home than in these days of public schools and social distractions, also that parents were more apt to show indignation at the perverseness of children than are parents to-day. This indignation impressed children and stirred similar reactions in them toward a perverse one of their number.[14] In the same way the gossip of the community concerning a recreant member, and particularly the indignation of the minister in his denunciation of sin, tended to stir the community against sinners. Here again we find in family and in neighbourhood behaviour similar attitudes.

The father did not rely entirely on his power to enforce obedience. He aimed also to invoke obedience by the manifest impartiality of

his rule. Impartiality was a maxim that was constantly kept in mind. But it was concerned primarily with externals, not with strict justice. The aim was to appear impartial before the other children. Though a conscientious child deserved more consideration than one who was not, the parent hesitated to give it lest the other children should not understand the reason for it and should feel that the parent had shown partiality. This was also the attitude of the local justice in deciding litigations. He was less concerned with dispensing fundamental justice than with deciding justly from the point of view of the customary ways in which people lived and business was carried on. That is, he looked at things from the point of view of the public, which does not know all the ins and outs of a case, and his aim was to decide in a way that would seem to the public impartial and fair.

We have noted certain contrasts, in this and the preceding chapters, of the individualistic American family with the European type described in Chapter VI. In America the social standing of an individual was a good deal determined by his personal qualities, particularly his wealth-producing qualities, and, later, by his wealth without primary regard to his personal qualities; his standing was not determined chiefly by his class and by the standing of his family in that class, as in the Old World.[15] This is not saying that a man's family had no influence on his social standing. The public in America always has judged people indiscriminately as members of the various groups to which they belong and this is true in a rural as well as an urban population. But, in America, economic conditions put a premium on personal success and conspicuously successful men were thereby lifted above an indiscriminate public judgment and judged as individuals, not merely as members of a family. This situation continues to-day. The contrast between European and American conditions comes out when Europeans migrate to the United States. Then the individual is isolated almost completely from his family group in the old country. He is judged as an individual and his standing is determined by his economic success. If his success is marked it is the more astounding to him because of the difficulty in his home country of getting recognition as an individual. It is "the comparison with his own previous condition and the condition of his people which makes him feel his personal importance in so strong and exaggerated a way." [16] Polish families in America who want to maintain the Polish family solidarity find this to be impossible because in Poland it is maintained by the influence of the whole community

of families on each, while, in America, the family is isolated, or the Polish community is in close contact with the great American civilization which discredits old-country beliefs in the eyes of the younger Poles. And "the members of the new generation, brought up in this new environment, are more likely to show a solidarity with one another as against the parents than a solidarity with the parents as against the younger members of the family. Finally, economic independence comes much earlier than in the old country and makes a revolt always materially easy. . . .

"The immigrant can therefore control his children only if he is able to substitute individual authority for social authority, to base his influence, not upon his position as representative of the group, but upon his personal superiority. But this, of course, requires a higher degree of individual culture, intellectual and moral, than most of the immigrants can muster. The contrary case is more frequent, where the children assume a real or imagined superiority to the parents on account of their higher instruction, their better acquaintance with American ways, etc." [17] Thus the immigrants from rural Europe go from the extreme of family conservatism to the extreme of individualism; and the conventional family of the old country is, in one or two generations, transformed into individualistic families in the new.

This individualistic family has begun to develop in European nations. It is due to the development of modern industry and the growth of cities. Thomas and Znaniecki point out that the individualization of the Polish family takes place when Poles emigrate from the rural districts to the cities of Poland. This emigration separates the individual from his family, makes him economically independent of it, and enables him to found a family and to support it independently of his relatives in the country and, perhaps, to win a higher economic position than they have.[18] Thus, in European nations, with the development of modern industry and the growth of cities, the tendency is toward the development of an individualistic family, though conditions in America have given an impetus to this development found nowhere else.

The individualistic family is an egoistic family.[19] It is the product of the individual's release from subservience to his kinship group. The young man feels that he is thereby free to satisfy his own impulses, and, when he marries, to centre himself in his family. He is not trained to feel any social responsibility. The nearest he comes to this is to feel an impulse for the social recognition of the family in

the community. This impulse is satisfied by winning what the community is centred on—material prosperity. It is satisfied regardless of the evil effects of its satisfaction on others. Wherefore, the individualistic family is by no means a type that conduces to social progress. It is a transition stage in the change from social subservience to kin to a rational social accountability.

The change from the individualistic to the rational family is one of the most intricate and interesting studies in social psychology. It may be studied in a family of the middle class in which the father is a hard-working man and the mother and children are intent on having the standard of living of families just above them. The father has in mind making his boys enterprising workers like himself, competent as he is to make and save money. He reluctantly acquiesces in their idleness while going through the public school, not however without frequent protests, especially as idleness means more or less frivolous and expensive living on their part, for which he has to pay the bills. His wife insists that they ought to have what other children have and to be permitted to do as other children do. If the husband remains obdurate, the wife feels she is not having what is due her and the children feel they are not having what is due them. Thus develops in the family a resentful attitude toward the father. He is a hard-working man and feels he must have rest in his home. And he cannot rest in an atmosphere of dislike. They are not hard-worked and so not in need of rest as he is. So they have the best of him and he may surrender to the standard of living they demand "in order to keep peace in the family." But this only increases their demands on him and compels him to keep his nose to the grindstone. Thus the head of the family, instead of being the dominating figure, as in the first period, finds himself more or less dominated by his family.

This development is most marked in the villages and cities but is seen to some extent in the rural districts. As one indignant and hard-working father exclaimed: "Things have come to a queer pass in these days. Your family demand a standard of living and a costly education that keeps your nose on the grindstone all the time. In spite of all you can do your children are growing up utterly inefficient, they are living a useless life, the money they demand for such useless living is outrageous, their mother says they ought to have it because other children do, and here you are working your head off that they may grow up frivolous and good-for-nothing." Such is the natural outcome of the individualistic family, the family that lives for ease and

social recognition. The pace is set by the families where money comes easily and in abundance, much of it made by lucky speculation. The first step toward becoming a rational family is this experience of the annoyance and folly of the behaviour of the individualistic family. The mother, instead of the father, may be the one opposed to the extravagant living and other follies of social rivalry. Whichever it is, headway is not made against the children and the parent bent on social recognition until the one who opposes them can give good reasons for his or her opposition to their behaviour. Those reasons lie in a sound theory of the social accountability of the family. Social progress requires that children grow up to be efficient workers; that is why they should not be allowed to live a frivolous, indolent life. They should have respect for other people's property; that is why they should learn the worth of a dollar by having to earn it. A sound theory of social accountability assumes that boys and girls are to be trained to be workers, not men at leisure and social ornaments; that they are to be trained in an active and virile sympathy with all groups of workers; that society has no use for the self-centred family. It is through the stand of parents, equipped with a sound theory of social accountability, against the attitude in their families for ease and social recognition, that headway is to be made against the individualistic family.

Another force that is making for the socialization of the family is the social conflict occasioned by the individualistic family. Individualism makes men wilful in the pursuit of their economic interests. The success of the strong and wilful invariably results in the defensive organization of others for the better realization of their interests. The families of those organized are exalted above their individualism by the appeal of the interests of the organization.[20] Agricultural organizations and labour organizations may thus inspire their members to sacrifice the petty aims of the individualistic family for the sake of realizing the purposes of the organization.

CHAPTER X

RELATIONS OF KINSHIP

TIES of kinship were much stronger in the early days than later. Family life in England and Holland emphasized the solidarity of the family with the kinship groups on both sides. This Old World tradition long affected family life in the colonies. The interest in tracing the genealogical tree was an expression of this sense of solidarity of kin. The sense of kin was not due to consciousness of a common descent but a common descent was of interest because of the sense of kin. To a degree, perhaps, it increased the sense of kin, but it served as a plausible explanation more than it operated as a cause.

In the New World conditions for a time favoured a continuance of a live sense of kin. Kinsmen settled in neighbourhoods of intimately associated families. Even if not congenial, kinsmen associated more or less intimately from a sense of duty. The strength of family ties described in the preceding chapters fostered ties of kinship. Children of the same family eventually founded other families, and ties between these families were strong in proportion to the strength of the ties between the children of the original family. For several reasons the ties between brothers and sisters were unusually strong in the early neighbourhood. First, the family was a more or less isolated group, often widely separated from neighbours, and children were much in each other's company. Also, there were no places of amusement to distract the children from the family life. Then too, the family was an economic unit. Boys and girls were put to work as soon as they were old enough to be of any use, and they worked together until they founded families of their own. So each early learned to assume responsibility. Because they assumed responsibility for helping the parents when young this attitude continued when they grew up and the parents grew old. Even after they married they felt under obligation to help their parents, when necessary, and to care for them in old age. This sense of a common responsibility united brothers and

sisters in an attitude of loyalty not only to their parents but to each other, which endured on through mature life.

To be sure there was much strife between children. Sisters often were jealous of one another and when they married their children acquired the dislike between the families. Brothers were rivalrous and sometimes hostile toward each other. The strife was augmented by the influence of the acquisitive and self-centred attitudes of the father, which infected the children. The tendency of brothers to quarrel and when older to disagree over property is seen in agricultural communities the world over. "Brothers quarrel but remain brothers" was a proverb in Europe and America. In spite of strife in the family, the sense of family solidarity continued after the children had grown up and founded families of their own. Married brothers and sisters continued after marriage to live in the same neighbourhood or in near neighbourhoods so that their children were intimately associated. A brother and a sister, out of loyalty, and often fondness for one another, fostered this intimacy of their children. The cousins realized they were expected to like each other. Thus kinship was an incentive to social intercourse, among families isolated from the world; and it strengthened the feeling that one could count on another in time of need. A person naturally turned to a kinsman for companionship, providing the latter was not uncongenial or forbidding, rather than to an outsider, simply because "blood is thicker than water." A man who did not warm toward kinsmen was called unnatural. As a result of this interest in kinship people were fond of tracing, by the hour, the kinship of this family and that family of the community; and they "counted" relationship out to second and third cousins.

Because of the emphasis on kinship people were quick to "claim relationship," particularly if the claim would reflect any credit on themselves. They were insistent on the duty of relatives to recognize the claims of relationship and to associate with one another rather than with outsiders. There were family reunions on holidays. And in the summer between haying and harvesting there were family reunions held in the open, which drew relatives from far and wide. A man who for any reason held aloof from this kinship association was intensely disliked.

Because it was customary for kinsmen to feel more sympathetically toward one another than toward outsiders, it was the more painful to have trouble wth kinsmen. Hence the maxim, "never work for your relations." The reason for this was explained on the ground

that "you don't want to have any trouble with your relations, so it is better not to work for them." An employer would expect more of a workman who was his kinsman because the latter would be expected sympathetically to enter into the work and to exert himself more than a hired labourer. The kinsman would not want thus to exert himself nor would he want to have words with his relative. So he had better not work for him.

Interest in kinship has diminished because kinsmen now scatter over the national domain and lose sight of each other. Where this is not so, other conditions have weakened ties of kinship. Family ties are somewhat less close than formerly, so the families of brothers and sisters care less for one another. The people with whom one intimately associates to-day are apt to be those with whom one is thrown in the course of work or recreation. Sometimes a man who wins a high station associates with others in that class and takes care to avoid relatives in a lower station. The fact of kinship is not entirely disregarded and forgotten. A man may give a relative financial assistance if the need is brought to his attention. Kinship is still felt to constitute more or less of an obligation, but the interest it once awakened has passed.

CHAPTER XI

ECONOMIC ATTITUDES

THE New World was settled for the most part by people of the middle class of the various European nations. The middle class originally arose out of the lower by superior industriousness, shrewdness and thrift. The Puritans of England and Holland, the Huguenots of France were middle class people. These people used the increasing economic freedom of the sixteenth and succeeding centuries to accumulate wealth and to provide themselves with the comforts of home that had begun to appear in the fifteenth century—cottages with chimneys, utensils, window-glass, better beds. Hence the distinction between the man who had the energy and shrewdness to provide himself with a comfortable home and the thrift to accumulate property and the ignorant, self-indulgent, less industrious workers. The energetic, self-restrained, home-loving people became the Puritans, and were distinguished from the lower class on the one hand and from the self-indulgent aristocracy on the other. The Puritans found their satisfaction in their home life and withdrew from the coarser revelry of the community. They opposed the Roman Catholic church to which the lower class belonged, as well as the Church of England as the church of the aristocracy.

Essential in the Puritan character was the acquisitive disposition. He was bent on the accumulation of wealth. This required restraint of impulses to spend; also saving of time that as much of the day as possible might be spent in gainful work; also saving of energy, which involved sexual control, that energy might be spent wholly in gainful work. The Puritan was not only acquisitive but resistful. He opposed self-indulgence not only because it wasted time and energy but also because it was a conspicuous trait of the aristocracy he defied and of the lower classes he despised. Some of his family attitudes, for instance his attitudes to marriage and divorce, were radical because of his defiance of the Roman Church and of the aristocracy that held the traditional attitudes.[1]

The English and Dutch Puritans came to the New World to get

away from classes and sects they defied, which controlled the governments of the Old World. They settled in largely self-governing communities the centre of which was the church, wherefore the New World offered a freedom they had never before known. These communities furnished exactly the conditions required for the full development of the type of character the attitudes of which had been slowly forming under the increasing economic freedom of the Old World.

The settlers represented the men and women of strongest individual initiative of the Old World middle class. That is why they emigrated from the Old World. The Protestant Reformation signified the rise of a new economic class, a middle class made up of those who by their power of initiative had accumulated money in farming, industry, and trade. Where this class was not numerous, as in France, the Reformation was suppressed. In all nations the families of initiative and self-restraint found themselves in conflict with the privileged classes and sought to escape the domination of these classes by emigrating to the New World. There they showed the same initiative that induced them to leave the Old World. Initiative characterized English and Dutch Puritans and French Huguenots, both men and women, not only in New York but even in the southern colonies where the climate was unfavourable to the exercise of initiative. "Tradition of South Carolina tells us that among the Huguenots 'men and their wives worked together in felling trees, building houses, making fences, and grubbing up their grounds.'" [2] In New York, the English and Dutch Puritan and the Huguenot families worked in the wilderness, clearing the land. Later, when the land had been made tillable and comfortable homes established, the children of these settlers as farmers exemplified the same initiative. However, except in rush seasons the women no longer worked in the fields.

Settlers were of two main types. First, there was the man of restless energy and daring initiative but lacking in the patience required of a successful tiller of the soil. In pioneering he was a born leader. But, as the country developed, he was more apt to take to dealing in cattle than to tilling the soil and so was inclined to move on further west when the population had settled down to cultivation. For this reason the early farming population of New York was less of this type than of the second to be mentioned. This was the born tiller of the soil, the mighty, patient worker; also a man of mechanical ingenuity, and of kindly impulses, but not so impetuous in his generosity as the pioneer type. The second type of settler more largely than

the first determined the rural psychology of New York in the first period. Consequently we turn to a description of the economic attitudes of the second type.

Several main conditions of rural life must be kept in mind in an analysis of economic attitudes. These conditions, as given in Chapter V, are the farmer's exposure to uncertain weather; his dependence on uncertain weather for the fruition of his crops; his isolation; his independence of people because of his ownership of land and other instruments of production; the hard and confining nature of the farmer's occupation. Attitudes due primarily to the weather have been described in preceding chapters. This chapter takes up economic attitudes which were due primarily to other conditions. While it is impossible to point to any attitude that was the result entirely of one set of conditions, some attitudes evidence certain determining conditions and in describing the attitudes, these conditions will be mentioned.

The early farmer was, above everything else, a mighty worker. Good judgment was an important asset but this did not enable a man to sit back and do nothing but direct the work of others. There was no place in rural life for men who could not work. Those whose work was not manual were esteemed according as they fitted in with the requirements of a working population. The doctor was "no good" unless he could "cure quick." The blacksmith, under the eye of the waiting farmer, worked with surprising deftness and rapidity. The farmer worked alone or with his boys or a hired man and so was dependent on his own initiative. A man who lacked initiative failed as a farmer. The farmer had the habit of strengthening his initiative by "taking a stent" of work for the day and resolving to finish his stent before night or be a quitter. One of the outstanding characteristics of the successful farmer was the way he made everything bend to the accomplishment of his purpose. Everybody on the farm must fit in with his plans. The farmer has been termed self-centred because of this trait but the word means nothing unless we visualize his economic situation. On his planning, energy and example depended the success of the whole enterprise. Consequently the man who could so plan and use others as to get his work done in spite of bad weather and other adverse conditions was the fit farmer under those conditions.

The farmer often went further in his own exertions and in instigating exertion in others than was required at the time. The frequency of situations requiring extreme effort got him into the habit of requir-

ing such effort when it was not really necessary. Many farmers seemed characteristically to require just a little more work of their boys than what they could comfortably do and this was one of the traits that then and still more later stirred resentment and defiance in sons and alienated them from the father. This attitude sometimes developed into the habit of wanting just a little more in trade than another was willing to give or of wanting a man to work for just a little lower wages than he was willing to work for. Thus the hard necessities of the physical environment developed the "grasping" farmer. When we consider that farmers were strenuous men, that their sons were unusually wilful because of the strong impulses stirred by the environment, we are not surprised at the serious disagreements that sometimes arose in families and between neighbours in the community.

The attitude of individual initiative and enterprise was one of those which fundamentally shaped rural behaviour. In their economic activity farmers insisted on the right to plan and work out their plans as they chose regardless of anybody's objections. In the political sphere they maintained that the government should not interfere except by necessary taxation and other customary restrictions; in the social sphere that a man might enjoy himself as he pleased, within the limits set by the customs of the community; and in the religous sphere that he might behave as he pleased, and do as he pleased on the Lord's day, within the limits set by the customs of the community. The idea never prevailed that a man might do entirely as he pleased. As we have seen, the training given children was contrary to this idea. Children were taught a rigorous self-restraint and this attitude was pronounced in adults. Liberty to do as you please always meant within the limits set by the customs of the community.

The early popular conception of liberty was, therefore, not an abstract idea but an orientation of certain social attitudes. Among these were the attitude of independence because of the free ownership of land and the attitude of enterprise and initiative in the cultivation of the land. These were not the sole basis of the idea of liberty, as will be seen in succeeding chapters. Other attitudes entered in and there was also the memory of the autocratic European governments which the settlers had left, and the fact that the conditions of the new world emphasized the importance of local as against centralized government. But, in spite of the fading memory of European oppression and the increase of centralized government, the independent ownership of land and individual initiative still foster some love of liberty among farm-

ers, which comes out whenever the farmer thinks his traditional rights are being taken away.

The early farmers realized that the basis of their liberty was the easy acquisition of, and the independent ownership of land. For this reason they were highly satisfied with their country and impatient with socialistic and other ideas that savoured of resistance to the existing government. This aversion to radicalism has continued to this day. Contrast this situation with that of the Russian peasants before the last revolution, when "a very large fraction of the 97,000,000 Russian peasants" had no land and felt "at once the 'need of land' and the impossibility of purchasing or of renting it." [3] Because they had no access to land they felt they had no liberty. On the contrary those of the peasants who were well-to-do and owned land were content with the existing political and social conditions and did not have the revolutionary tendencies of the landless peasants.[4] These tendencies were therefore due not to political disabilities so essentially as to economic, that is, a landless condition that forced the mass of peasants into the wage-earning class. This condition developed doctrines that justified discontent with such a condition.[5] In rural America, with its abundant land, discontent and justifying ideas did not arise. Hence the difference between Russian and American views as to private property.

The American farmer owned his land and worked for the most part alone. These conditions begot an attitude of self-reliance. This attitude was fostered as a cherished belief in every sphere of social behaviour. In the family the parents, ever mindful of the time when the children must leave the paternal roof and shift for themselves, insisted on a self-reliant performance of tasks. "Stand on your own footin' " was an injunction constantly heard. To shield a child from responsibility because he was not quite so robust as the others was considered equivalent to spoiling him. Self-reliance was seldom given secondary explanations, for the injunctions of parents were accepted as a matter of course. Occasionally, however, a parent enlarged on its importance. "If everybody was always relying on somebody else, who would get things done?" A real leader was one who relied on himself. The schoolmaster continued this training and gave it a turn that appealed to the sentiments. In his talks to the children he quoted Emerson's words in his essay on *Self-Reliance*: "Trust thyself: every heart vibrates to that iron string." Nor was the turn which Emerson gives these words—the resignation he reads into the attitude

—foreign to rural character, for the farmer strengthened his self-reliance by accepting his lot without complaint. The church constantly emphasized self-reliance. The minister glorified that trait in his character studies of the Old Testament prophets, and the songs that celebrated it were sung with a ring, for instance:

"Dare to be a Daniel;
Dare to stand alone;
Dare to have a purpose firm and
Dare to make it known."

The independent ownership of the farmer put him in a position to feel freedom in his work, and his enjoyment of free action was one of his chief enjoyments. He was free to plan as he pleased, and to "favour himself" in doing his work. To be sure, in a rush of work he felt compelled to exert himself to the utmost. But there was no boss compelling him. This freedom stimulated his self-reliance and made it not a merely dogged trait but an attitude conducive to self-realization.

The farmer's work included a diversity of occupations and required a good deal of technical knowledge. This was handed down orally from generation to generation. It was acquired by sons as they grew up on the farm and worked under the direction of their fathers. Artisans and professional men acquired much of their knowledge in the same way. A boy who did not want to "farm it" went to work as a carpenter's apprentice or in the office of a lawyer or doctor. Naturally the tendency of a boy to follow the occupation of his father was much stronger than in these days of professional and agricultural schools. The tendency to adhere to custom had as one of its important aspects this tendency to follow the occupation of the father.

The farmer prided himself on his craft knowledge and skill. He knew how to handle a variety of farm tools, how to make or, at least, repair them, how to breed, raise, train, feed and slaughter animals and cut up and preserve meat, how to detect and treat diseases of animals, how to select seed, select the proper soil for different crops, prepare the soil, plant, cultivate, harvest and preserve the crops, how to set out and care for an orchard, manage an apiary and a sugar bush. Farming was more diversified than it is to-day. The development has been from the diversified farming of the first period to the specialized hop, wheat and other farming of the second period and then back to a more diversified farming in the third period. The farmer had less

scientific knowledge than the farmers of to-day but his work required a good deal of knowledge and skill. He enjoyed the assurance of knowing his job with the knowledge that is gained in the school of experience. Because it was thus gained it was largely a knowledge of the customary ways of doing things. But the diversity of the knowledge required and the farmer's necessity of depending on himself, in his isolation, fostered ingenuity, which was another ground of assurance.

The essential economic method of the early days was direct attack upon nature. This developed persistence—keep digging, sawing, striking, shoving, prying, heaving until the obstacle gives way. Persistence was particularly in evidence when a man was working with other men. For it was stimulated by rivalry, which impels one to accomplish what he has set out to do because others are looking on. But it was characteristic also of the lone farmer in varying degrees according to his capacity. Conspicuous persistence was exceptional and marked a man off from his fellows. It was persistence which the father urged upon his son going out to "try his luck" in the great world: "Whatever you do, John, do it with all your might." This trait was preached by schoolmaster and clergyman. It was the outstanding trait of the much lauded "self-made man." In the farmer, as in men in other occupations, it often was carried to such an extreme as to weaken his efficiency. Influenced chiefly by this trait the farmer's main desire, when he began a piece of work, was to "get it done and off his mind." This led him to "keep hammering away at one thing from daylight till dark" so that he came to the close of the day's work completely tired out. In this he was inferior in efficiency to the farmer of good judgment who, by varying his work, achieved more with less effort.

The persistence of the farmer developed a pronounced mental attitude—the trait called doggedness. "'Tis dogged that does it" was a maxim in common use. The dogged mind may be "slow" but when it finds something that must be mastered it masters it and "gets it for good."

Persistence implies concentration of effort. This was not characteristic of all farmers for all were not equally capable of it. A more widely prevalent trait was industriousness, which means constant working, day in and day out, week in and week out, year after year. Neighbours measured each other's worth according to conventional standards of industriousness, not industriousness shrewdly exercised.

The farmer who failed to have his chores done and to be in the field by six in the morning, the housewife who failed to have her washing out before nine, were condemned even if, though arising later than their neighbours, they accomplished more by "using their wits" as well as their hands. Industriousness continues essential in rural behaviour. Young men educated in agricultural schools sometimes like to believe that their education will make hard work unnecessary. Then as farmers they find their crops are smaller than those of an industrious and painstaking neighbour. Industriousness always will be one of the essential traits of the successful farmer. But mere industriousness, mere activity in the customary ways, with or without good judgment, is less emphasized than formerly.

Industriousness involved endurance. The industrious person could not let his or her weariness interfere with work. All suffered hardships; none, well-to-do or poor, could escape them. The summer's heat was oppressive to the haymakers, the winter's cold benumbing to the woodsmen. The constant exertion through long hours made work, indoors and out, excessively wearisome. Especially was this true in times of special work when a "good spell of weather" compelled the farmer to work day and night. So stolid endurance of weariness and hardship was characteristic of the early period. A slight indisposition was disregarded. Except in cases of serious illness or accident the custom was to "laugh it off" and "go to work and forget it."

Stolidity was an attitude that pervaded rural behaviour. A man who "showed his feelings" while listening to a sermon or to music, or even in bereavement, was disapproved of because he did not "control his feelings better." Thus repression, due primarily to the strenuous economic life, left its mark on behaviour generally. Though restrained, emotions were powerful when they did break forth.

Self-restraint caused an uncompromising attitude toward self-indulgence. This attitude of self-denial extended over the whole range of behaviour. There was a denial of impulses for "luxuries" in food and drink. The farmer lived well [6] but confined his diet as far as possible to what he produced and did not find a ready market for. One who "hankered after dainties" was ridiculed. So was the fellow who was at all particular in his dress. Farmer boys often took pride in showing by their dress that they "didn't care how they looked." Self-denial was particularly emphasized in connection with forbidden amusements. Amusements were forbidden because of their "evil tendency." Dancing and theatre-going were associated with licentious-

ness, card-playing and billiard and pool-playing with gambling, liquor-drinking with intoxication. These vices unfitted the farmer for that "sober, righteous and godly life" that was necessary for a successful struggle with nature. But self-denial was carried further than this, and there was a tendency to think of any pleasure as somehow bad. It was contrary to the strenuous economic attitudes and the serious religious attitudes. There was danger that people by enjoying themselves might get carried away, to the neglect of their work and their church. The church gave self-denial a variety of sanctions and prescribed certain customary expressions of it, which caused it to be carried to an extreme that the common sense of the individual, uninfluenced, never would have permitted. For instance, extremely religious people observed the custom called tithing, that is, gave one-tenth of their income to the church, and many of them thereby were forced to unreasonable self-denial.

Because of the rigorous self-denial, there was a tendency to go to an extreme in the few satisfactions that were not socially tabooed. The farmer allowed no man to tell him what he should not eat, for the sake of his health, and this was one reason for the immoderate eating that characterized the rural districts, with its train of bodily ills and the resulting vogue of patent medicines. Similarly he had his will in sex relations, as the large families show. Men felt that their lives were narrowed by hard work and they did not propose to scrimp themselves on the few pleasures within their reach, though they did deny themselves expensive foods.

Self-denial accentuated also the farmer's grip on his property. The deep-seated attitude for private property in rural America cannot be understood without keeping in mind the sacrifice incurred in wringing wealth from the soil. So much has been said about the money made in land speculation that we sometimes forget the great mass of plodding farmers who never made any money in that way. They worked for what they got. As the child was dear to the mother because of what she had to endure to give it birth and bring it up, so was his property dear to the farmer because of the sacrifice he had to undergo in order to accumulate it.

The farmer was secretive in this his main interest. He did not want anyone to know how much he was worth and sometimes did not even tell his family. He did not want people to know of his business dealings or how he had made his will. So when he needed advice he was accustomed to go to some man who was known to be "close-

mouthed" and in whose judgment he had confidence, often the community doctor. This absorption in property and secrecy in accumulation and bequest is characteristic of the farmer to the present day. An editor of a rural paper who has the confidence of thousands of farmers gets many letters each year asking his advice on a variety of subjects, particularly about property and its bequest. In spite of all the "reasons" that may be given for this secrecy there seems to have been something instinctive in it, something akin to the dislike of having mere acquaintances come in just when the family was eating. The secrecy urge was powerful and it continues to this day.

The ultimate aim of the farmer was the accumulation of wealth and this required work and thrift. The work required to bring wealth from the soil made the farmer know the worth of a dollar. But this alone does not explain the attitude of thrift for the worker in factory and foundry toils as hard but is apt to be less thrifty. There are several reasons for the conspicuous thrift of the early farmer. First, what he produced was perishable and he developed the habit of carefully saving his produce. From the time he sowed the seed he was cherishing a crop. An unusually wet or dry season caused him to make special efforts to "save the crop." When it came to maturity he had to harvest and preserve it from rodents and the weather. Naturally this saving habit was sometimes carried to an extreme. As one old resident said, "Father told us to eat the partly rotten apples first and the result was that all winter we were eating rotten apples." The farmer aimed to save what he had worked so hard to bring to maturity, and this attitude was transferred in various connections. The farmer was careful of his clothing, his tools, his animals and he saved his money.

The second condition that emphasized thrift was the fact that the farmer was independent. Everything he saved in the course of work was his own. Wherefore, both he and his wife developed shrewdness in the saving of materials. He would "tinker up" an old tool rather than buy a new one and she would "get along" with her old kitchen utensils. They were saving also in the steps they took, and in planning their work so as to accomplish most with least effort. In driving the team the boy was taught to drive in a way to accomplish most with least effort. Thus the farmer often built up an organization of high efficiency. When the question arose of the expenditure of money for a new building or a new piece of furniture it was discussed by husband and wife over a long period and the money was spent in

a way to "go the farthest." Thrift insinuated itself even into the period of the year when people are naturally most lavish, the Christmas season; the family emphasized the buying of useful presents or the giving of home-made presents. A too generous husband was upbraided by his wife for presenting her with an object of her heart's desire, to which he replied that he got it on his own account; he did not want to have to hear constantly how much she wished she had it.

On the other hand when, in the second period, the farmer came to produce more largely for the market, and came to live off his bank account the habit of thrift weakened. But it continued stronger among the rural population, generally speaking, than among those living in villages and cities. There wages come regularly at short intervals and this encourages spending on the expectation of a regular income. As contrasted with this, the income of the farmer is less certain and regular, and this has caused him to realize that he cannot spend all the money on hand. He must save and this necessity fosters the saving habit. There is another important difference between farmers' and factory workers' social incentives to thrift. The latter live in villages and cities which are replete with stimuli to spend—the show windows, the social life on the street and in the social circles and organizations—while farmers are less subjected to these temptations.

The essential tendency of human nature is to satisfy impulses thoughtlessly so that spending is a stronger tendency than saving. Spending means to satisfy impulses while saving means to restrain them. When restraint is compelled by the existing conditions there develops a social attitude of self-restraint which is strengthened by various sanctions. But it is apt to pass as soon as hard necessity no longer compels restraint. As we say, to spend is "more natural than to save." Thought for the future is an intellectual process of which few people are capable to any extent, hence, under easy economic conditions, the natural tendency to spend becomes a social attitude. So the saving person who still reacts according to the attitude of restraint of the past is apt to be ridiculed. The ridicule of thrift is due not only to the fact that it is unusual but also to the spendthrift's sense of superiority over him whom necessity compels to save. Among the early farmers it was hard necessity that compelled restraint of impulses. Life was intolerable as a hired man and to escape this fate a man must acquire land and save in order to pay for it. He restrained impulses to spend for the sake of making those payments. He carefully saved

his produce for the sake of selling the produce saved. So the habit of looking to the future was an everyday habit. It was not a matter altogether of foresight but a habit. This habit is seen in idioms used by the farmer. For instance, the habit inclined him to buy what was cheapest with little regard for quality and this preference for cheapness led to the use of the idiom "it's cheaper" for any way of doing that seemed more economical than another, whether because it saved time or energy or money. The phrase was also still more broadly used to express a preference for a way of doing just because it was the customary way. For instance, argue convincingly with an old farmer as to the time and energy which might be saved by doing things in a new way and he would reply "Yes, but I think the old way is cheaper." He meant merely, "I'd rather stick to the old way."

Because of the prevailing thrifty attitude those who were inclined to spend somewhat more liberally than was customary hesitated to do so. People were relentlessly judged by their neighbours according to the customary standard of thrift. The question was not how much a man produced and enjoyed but how much he saved. The farmer who dared to buy a new carriage or a new piece of furniture was denounced as "getting high-toned" or "living beyond his means." One who was enterprising enough to invest now and then in a new piece of farm machinery was characterized as "a reckless fellow, filling his barns with old iron." The approved farmer was the one who measured up to the customary standard of thrift. For this reason among others, prosperous farmers were very apt to continue living much as they had before prosperity came to them.

The character of the early farmer was thus thoroughly organized for accumulation of wealth under the standards of the community. He had the industriousness to go forth each day, however extreme the heat or cold, to toil till night; the resolution to conquer every obstacle by ingenuity or persistence; the shrewdness to make every move count, not one false motion; the generosity to bear the brunt of the work and so incite others to do their best; self-control that, while directing with decision and occasionally inciting by sardonic humour, stopped short of impatient abuse and insolent bossing; and the self-denial to save as much as possible of what he produced.

The method of direct attack on nature developed pugnacity in the farmer. Sometimes he berated an obstacle as if it were an animate thing. Much of his activity involved the use of farm animals and he was aggressive in his treatment of them. His attitude to his boys

and his hired men was similarly rigorous. He spared neither himself nor anybody else. This was not due to a conscious money-making motive but to his interest in accomplishing his material purpose. Often it could be accomplished only by main force. Another reason for his pugnacious attitude was that he was often hampered by a bad season. A late spring worried him and caused him to rush into his work when the season did open, and he expected his men to rush too, though they had not the interest in so doing that he had. This trait of pugnacity characterized some farmers extremely while others scarcely showed it at all. Therefore, it is to be distinguished from that tendency of social relationship which made the father invariably the directing figure in his economic enterprise. But while making this distinction we must recognize that the degree in which the father was the directing figure depended somewhat on his pugnacity. If he lacked this, if he was easy-going, easily discouraged, the members of the family were impatient with him. He was expected to make good his social position of authority by the requisite forcefulness.

Pugnacity that made good generally recognized rights was socially approved, while merely impulsive pugnacity was not. The church held that "temper" and a tendency to fight were not in accord with the Christian spirit. And certain widely prevalent expressions of pugnacity were exceedingly sinful, for instance, swearing. Because forbidden in the Bible this was regarded as a sin and the use of "by-words" was discouraged in children as tending toward swearing. Swearing satisfied pugnacity because it was an emphatic expression and also because, as a sin, it expressed the defiance of God and man that characterized the pugnacious sinner. The church opposed wilful pugnacity but supported assertion of rights.

Because the economic life of the early days stimulated pugnacity, there was a good deal of conflict over ownership of property. However, owing to the universally recognized institution of private property, which restricted the rights of each individual to the particular part of nature that constituted his private property, conflict between individuals for the same wealth was limited to wealth the ownership of which was not clear. Thus a tree growing on a boundary line raised a dispute as to its proper owner, while trees growing on one side or another of a mutually recognized boundary were appropriated without conflict. However, the lack of traditional boundary lines rendered cases of disputed ownership frequent, both in the ecclesiastical and the civil courts. Litigation was regarded by the community as a

praiseworthy method of standing up for one's rights. It was customary to litigate all, even the most trivial disputes, and a man was called a coward if he yielded short of a justice's decision.

But courage ceased to be a virtue when it went further than defence of customary or legal rights. The man who was "eternally higgling with the 'sessor," or who "flared up when his neighbour's cows broke into his corn," or who was "hard on" those in his debt, or who was habitually trying in "small ways" to get the best of his neighbours, was condemned as a "penny-pincher," or as "grinding the face of the poor." When the question was not one of resistance to a ruthless over-riding of customary or legal rights, it was the man who generously yielded the point, as if the small loss involved meant nothing to him, who was socially approved.

During the first decades of the nineteenth century the feeling that all were equally subservient to the necessities of a hard environment fostered a robust sense of equality and fellow feeling. Neighbours had an attitude of helpfulness towards one another. No one was so favoured by fortune as to feel above the common lot and the obligation of mutual aid. At the same time neighbours regarded each other's increasing wealth with jealousy. As the attitude of helpfulness of the first decades weakened, jealousy increased. There were those who were not slow to imagine that, in one way or another, their neighbours were "taking advantage." For instance, when, in the spring, the town road commissioner began repairing the highways, he was abused by farmers for not repairing their roads first—and this not on account of any immediate necessity, but because others were being served first. The reasonableness of repairing first those roads most used did not appeal to the jealous farmer. Rivalry in the struggle for wealth was, however, less important than the persistent attack of each individual upon nature in that little domain legally secured to him as his private property.

Though the farmer worked alone, there were operations that required co-operation, as logging and gathering in the harvest. The co-operation was naturally directed by the owner of the farm and there was apt to be a good deal of inward "cussing" if he was a "hog-headed" man. However, a farmer of unusually good judgment was apt to be deferred to, even in co-operation on another man's farm. Such a man was very highly prized in the community and his directions were "just naturally" followed. While the workers took the directions of the natural leader in a situation in which all were interested

in achieving a desired result, they resisted mere "bossing." Perhaps the main reason the big feeling man was disliked was that "you can't tell him anything." In a situation in which all were intent on accomplishing a certain result, a man who tried to tell what *he* knew, instead of keeping his mouth shut and following the directions of the natural leader, was intensely disliked. He was disliked not only in the relations of the day's work but also in the social life of the community. His big-feeling attitude, his pompous greeting, his conceit in conversation were resented. Men's interest was not in a man's imagination of or recollection of his own superiority but in proof of it through results achieved. These were apt to be in inverse ratio to the degree of conceit. So the mere fact of conceit was generally taken as proof that it was without any solid basis. "Give him enough rope and he'll hang himself" was the general comment on that kind of man.

The good neighbour was the one who had an attitude of helpfulness. This attitude was customary in the neighbourhood. A man who had the esteem of his fellows must be not only an industrious worker but also a good neighbour. He must willingly help a neighbour in time of need. Thus, when two woodsmen were working independently in adjoining wood-lots, each would go to the help of the other as he struggled to "skid" a log on to the bob-sled. "I'll help you" was, on occasion, the impulsive attitude of the farmer to his neighbour. Generosity was the initiatory force in co-operation. The neighbour to whom a farmer most readily went for assistance was not the "grouty" neighbour but the cheery, generous one. So the generous man had a greater number in his debt than the ungenerous, which made him more ready to ask for help when he was in a "tight pinch." Thus the generous man was less apt to over-exert and injure himself than the ungenerous. The fit man was, then, not the extremely self-centred man but the one of generous impulses.[7]

The generous person was apt to assume that others would be alike generous and to expect it of them. And there were people who acted generously in order to get a return. They were really selfish. So general was the expectation of a return that the warning given the recipient of bounty, "you'll have to pay for it," became a common proverb. Thus when a spell of pleasant weather was enjoyed in March, on all sides was heard the warning, "We'll have to pay for this in April." Wherefore, people generally accepted favours only with the understanding that they would expect to return them. People were

averse to accepting favours from those to whom they did not want thus to be "put under obligation." For often men "took advantage" of their relations as benefactors to ask "more than they had a right to." Co-operation therefore meant more than a mere impulsive giving and receiving of aid. It was an habitual relation of mutual helpfulness between neighbours. Co-operation involved a willingness to accommodate and a promise to return in kind. The farmer tended to be conscientious about returning in kind, even to the point of expecting his wife to give "the threshers" as good a dinner as he had at their threshing. This sense of obligation tended to extend to the merely social affairs of neighbours. One who enjoyed a good dinner at a neighbour's house felt obliged to give as good a dinner in return.

One of the most common aspects of this "you-help-me-and-I'll-help-you" relation was borrowing and lending. Mowing machines and horse-rakes were not generally used until after the Civil War, and there was a good deal of borrowing of these and other farm implements. As the inequality in wealth increased and the use of machinery was extended some farmers had more machinery than others, and the latter hesitated to borrow from the former because they could not return in kind. This form of co-operation thus diminished. So did the borrowing and lending of goods for consumption. In the early days when a guest arrived unexpectedly, the farmer borrowed what was needed of a neighbour and paid in kind, while to-day canned goods are kept in the house for such an emergency. Until after the advent of matches in 1835 the custom of borrowing fire was universal, giving rise to the proverbial query, "Did you come for fire?" when the housewife, who had run into her neighbour's house for a chat said she "must hurry back." In other ways the families of the neighbourhood were dependent on each other where now they are independent.

The custom of mutual help was increased by the averseness of the independent farmer to taking pay for work, for thus he would put himself in the position of a hired man. Rather than to take pay for what he did he preferred to help his neighbour and then to feel free to ask help in return. Another reason for the importance of mutual helpfulness was the fact that neighbours often were kinsmen who naturally helped one another. Still another was the fact that the farmer was not accustomed to business relations. Also almost any farmer was certain to need a neighbour's help, and it was a comparatively simple matter to barter services. But in addition to all these conditions was the relation of goodwill between neighbours. It was

an attitude that affected conduct in many ways. A man would not take pay from a neighbour for "garden truck," or for a piece of spare rib. He felt hurt by a neighbour's offering to pay for things given him or for help received. It was because offering to pay implied a failure to recognize his attitude of goodwill. But this relation of goodwill depended a good deal on economic equality. Consequently, as economic inequality increased, goodwill weakened. A poor man had not much to give and so shrank from assuming an attitude of neighbourly generosity to a well-to-do neighbour. One who did was apt to be suspected by his well-to-do neighbour of an intention to "come it over him."

In contrast with these friendly relations between neighbours, the farmer's business relations beyond the immediate neighbourly circle bore the stamp of his self-centred relation to the soil. We have here a fine example of transmutation. For his attitude of persistent attack on nature and clever getting around obstacles which he could not overcome by the straightforward drive determined to a considerable degree his business relations. Persistent attack implied a "set idea," and in his business relations he prided himself on sticking to his idea and making the other eventually "come round." If a farmer had a horse or cow to sell and another wanted to buy, the former would state his price, after a long parley in which each had hesitated to venture a figure, and then they would separate and meet again and separate and so on, each persisting in trying to close the bargain at his own figure. Again, if a farmer wanted to trade one animal for another he would speak to the owner and, even if the latter was averse to trading, would persist in mentioning the trade whenever they met, perhaps for months until finally the trade was put through. This persistence of the farmer in adhering to his own idea is an attitude that pervaded every aspect of his behaviour. It was derived in the last analysis from his strenuous attack on physical nature.

Another attitude that entered into business dealings was similar to the farmer's attitude as an assembler of labour. To understand how a piece of work is to be done, to plan how three men are to work together to accomplish most with least effort, to direct each in his movements in a way to realize this end, requires foresight and clever suggestion. Now, in a business deal the farmer used foresight and clever suggestion in the same way. He anticipated what the other man would think about the deal and what he would say and suggested what would induce him to think and do what he wanted

him to think and do. He felt justified in taking advantage of another's lack of knowledge, as long as he did not deliberately deceive the other. In fact he was rather proud of a transaction that displayed his superior knowledge, especially if the other's lack of knowledge was of something every farmer was expected to know.

Farmers did not, and do not to-day, think of themselves as competing with each other as sellers of grain or other products in the open market, as do merchants or manufacturers. To be sure the farmer realized that a large supply tends to lower the price and some farmers, when they saw the neighbours planting a good deal of a certain crop, were inclined to plant something else. But the farmer's competition with other farmers was, and to a large extent still is, limited to deals with neighbours in which each, as above indicated, tries to put the deal through as he wants it. The farmer has a good deal of the same attitude in bargaining with his hired help. And the hired help develop a good deal of the same attitude to him. In some sections this has resulted in farm labourers, and particularly tenants, more or less systematically trying to get the best of the owners of the farms. Where this prevails the fair and generous owner is not apt to be treated differently from the grasping one. So in the farmer's relations with neighbours and with his labourers and tenants a good deal of the primitive individualism persists.

In getting the best of a deal a farmer always had in mind his dependence on the good opinion of his neighbours. So deceit and underhanded dealings were exceptional. What he gained he wished to be clearly gained by his superior wit or power of impressing others with his ideas. That is, he wanted to get the best of a neighbour in a way that he could tell of with some satisfaction. He wanted his neighbour to feel, if later he came to think he had got the worst of a bargain, that "it was his own fault," "and not go blabbing around the neighbourhood about how he had been imposed on."

The farmer had also in mind the possibility of a neighbour retaliating in some way if he felt outrageously cheated. Because of the isolated life the tendency was to nurse a grievance. One vowed he would "get even" with another who had got the best of him in some underhanded way. So the farmer did not like to imagine that somebody was on his trail, or that somebody was talking him down and setting the neighbours against him. Nor was it merely fear that deterred from sharp practice. "You wouldn't want to be treated that way yourself" was the rebuke a high-minded farmer gave one who had

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Delaware, Ohio

turned a trick on him. The rule of the best farmers was to "do as you would be done by."

The business relations of the farmer were largely personal. There were few "writings." The farmer was averse to signing his name. There were stories of farmers who had lost their farms just by signing their names. The personal nature of obligations sometimes had curious consequences. Instance the prevailing notion that a creditor's death cancels a debt. For this reason "it is easier to get blood out of a stone than to collect from a dead man's debtors." The personal nature of the economic relations of the neighbourhood go a long way toward explaining the economic attitudes of those days; and the passing of those attitudes is to be explained, among other ways, by the substitution of written agreements for the primitive oral understandings.

The personal economic relations of the early neighbourhood favoured certain customs, among which was the custom of using the pledged word in many cases where a written contract is now required. Hence the attitude of personal honour—"Your word as good as your note." Economic relations were not possible unless a pledge was reliable, as reliable as the signed agreement. The good citizen was not only the "son of toil," but the "honest son of toil." Honour was perhaps more used than honesty to imply fidelity to word, doing as one engaged to do. Honesty applied more narrowly to relations involving a transfer of wealth, in which it implied, for instance, not misrepresenting goods or ability to pay or not charging more than goods or services were worth. Truthfulness meant, not cleverly avoiding telling a falsehood while conveying the false impression desired, but "telling the truth just as it was." Sincerity meant "not pretending to be what you are not." In the matter of fact relations of those early days and in a community where everybody knew everybody else, it was difficult successfully to pretend to be what one was not, to tell an untruth and not be found out, successfully to misrepresent goods, and to get out of paying one's debts or otherwise to fail to do as agreed. Any of these deficiencies brought on the individual the disapproval and contempt of the community.

The above mentioned attitudes are of course not strictly economic attitudes. In the family children learned to keep their word, not to cheat at games, to tell the truth, and not to pretend to be what they were not. But these attitudes acquired an economic character as the boy grew to manhood and became more involved in the material side

of life. Rural conditions strengthened these attitudes. They weakened when the economic relations of the farmer became more complex and when social rivalry increased social lying and hypocricy.

The farmer liked the man who was "out and out" in his honour and honesty. That is, he wanted to be certain of these attitudes in the man with whom he was dealing. For this reason he liked to see a man estimate a debt with strict accuracy to the last cent and not say of a fraction of a dollar, "Let it go." To this he would reply, "No, a square deal is a square deal," and pay his debt to the last cent. Nor on the other hand did he like to have a man insist on the half cent due him and so take the half cent that did not belong to him. Farmers were keen in detecting each other's attitudes. Attitudes which they liked, they wanted to see pronounced in another.

Thus social attitudes were essential in the behaviour of the farmer. But the attitudes of the individual depended in part on the personal impulses that were temperamentally strong in him. Some men were by nature more generous than others, some more honest. However, social approval required that a man exemplify the prevailing degree of generosity and honesty. To get on with farmers one must understand the prevailing attitudes. No matter how exemplary a man's behaviour from the point of view of an exalted ethical ideal, farmers would scarcely trust him unless his behaviour exemplified their attitudes and ways of doing. They would not understand him. His behaviour might be consistent with his ideal but would not seem rational to them from the point of view of their attitudes.

The attitudes described in this chapter were those of a settled agricultural population. They implied a sense of permanence of their relations on the part of the farmers of a neighbourhood. If a farmer felt that his neighbour was there permanently he would be more anxious for his goodwill, more willing to help him, more careful, in his conversation, of his neighbour's honour than if the neighbour was "here to-day, gone to-morrow." When the sense of solidarity of the neighbourhood weakened, because of the increasing migration from the rural districts to the villages and cities and from one neighbourhood to another, the attitudes began to change. Take, for instance, the attitude of helpfulness. The reciprocity of helpfulness was at first undetermined as to the time given and the exertion required. That is, an act of help did not necessarily create an expectation of an exact return in time worked or kind of work but simply strengthened the habitual expectation of help when needed—whatever help a situation

might require. But when the sense of solidarity began to weaken, the particular act of help became important as an economic service return of which might be expected, while it had little social value as a means of strengthening the habitual expectation. This change came when the inhabitants of the neighbourhood were less permanently settled and families were less thoroughly friendly.

The farmer's relation with neighbours thus began to have something of the aspect of a business relation. But it was in relations with dealers in farm produce that the business relation had its extreme development. In selling the tendency was to bargain up to the last and the farmer would not sell until he could feel he had the "top price." He demanded an exorbitant price if he thought the dealer much wanted his product. His bargaining was not guided by any rational policy, for instance, to develop the reputation of being a reasonable man to deal with. He liked rather the reputation of being a hard man to deal with for that meant a man whom the dealer could not easily "handle." The farmer realized that he was not shrewd and that he lacked the dealer's knowledge of the market, and this made him suspicious of the dealer. This antagonism between farmer and dealer seems inevitable and the natural solution is the co-operative marketing of farm produce.

The attitudes of the individualistic farmer have proved to be contrary not only to profitable marketing but also to profitable production. The purpose of the settler was to clear the land and exploit the virgin soil. Exploitation continued after the situation began to call for conservation. The land was stripped of its trees and then of its fertility. Extensive instead of intensive farming continued even on into the third period. This was due to hidebound adherence to the customary extensive farming and to lack of agricultural training. In recent years such training has been more sought than formerly by the more capable of the younger farmers.

The economic attitudes of the farmer affected all classes in the community—business men, doctors, lawyers, politicians, clergymen as well as farmers. For instance, the clergyman had to be a worker as well as a preacher. As a preacher he had to show courage. His attack on sinners must be straight from the shoulder. And if he happened to meet one of the sinners in a belligerent mood because of the pulpit bombardment and the sinner signified that only respect for the cloth restrained him from thrashing the parson, it did not injure the prestige of the parson at all to divest himself of his cloth and thrash

the sinner. The politician back from the legislature in his address to his fellow townsmen on his arduous labours gave them a minimum of information but used the phraseology that aroused deep-seated attitudes and made him seem one with them in character and belief. The rural attitudes were the attitudes of the farmer, and the behaviour of men in other occupations was influenced and more or less determined by them.

CHAPTER XII

ATTITUDES OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL MEN

The Manufacturer

MANUFACTURES developed in New York after the Revolution and especially during and after the War of 1812. Factories were scattered throughout the rural districts. They made the wheat, logs and other products of the farm into flour, lumber and other goods; also made tools, kitchen utensils, tableware, brick and other articles of rural consumption. The building of the canals and of roads from these into the interior made it possible to haul products to the canals and thence to ship them to the cities and to the seaport, New York.[1] This system of transportation increased export trade and greatly increased the prosperity of the farmer.

The manufacturer often had been a farmer and, perhaps, continued to manage his farm after he had come to give most of his time to his factory. He was the unusual farmer who was skilled in buying and selling and in the management of workmen. The early manufacturers were respected as men of superior ability and information. They were in constant contact with the farmers because they bought their raw materials directly from the farms. They had the farmer's attitudes of honour, honesty and mutual help. In their shrewd dealings they had an eye to the approval of the farming community, and a miller was proud to say that the farmers of his section would not sell their wheat to anybody else. The farmers regarded the miller's prosperity with unaffected goodwill, ascribed it to his superior ability, and supported him if he aspired to represent his constituency in the state legislature or in Congress.

The small factories gradually disappeared from the rural districts. In recent years they have been replaced by canning factories, milk stations, apple evaporators and other factories for manufacturing farm produce. Some farmers hold stock in these factories. Occa-

sionally a farmer owns a factory. But they are owned largely by village or city dwellers. The social bond between manufacturer and farmer has disappeared. The interest of the factory lies in getting the farmers' produce at the lowest price, and this purely business relation involves the conflict of interests that is inevitable under profit-seeking.

However, the manufacturers of to-day sometimes have distinctly rural traits that distinguish them from other manufacturers. In one case a successful manufacturer in a large city is the son and grandson of successful rural manufacturers of the early days and his business relations are so conspicuously marked by the rural trait of generosity as to distinguish him from other manufacturers of that city. His theory of business differs from theirs as do his relations with his workmen. He is respected by other manufacturers because of his ability and success but his business ideas and his humane treatment of sick or unfortunate workmen are said to be "not good business." The importance of this process of transmutation of attitudes as between the rural parts and the cities is just beginning to be realized.

The Storekeeper

In the early days men were interested primarily in the clearing and cultivation of the land. Farmers had little wherewith to buy goods and bought only necessities. With agricultural prosperity came a growth of manufactures, which supplied the farmer with improved tools and utensils and some luxuries; and stores multiplied in the rural villages. The business of the storekeeper was unlike that of the farmer or manufacturer. The service he rendered was not that of producing but of distributing goods. He provided what the farmer needed and enabled him to get it at least cost, often on credit. But to the farmer, who looked at things from the point of view of the production of crops, the merchant did not create anything. The farmer could not appreciate the service he rendered though he admitted the convenience of having a store in the neighbourhood, particularly if the storekeeper gave credit liberally. In many rural neighbourhoods there was only one store. If there were two stores the farmer traded at the one that was "handiest," provided no storekeeper was his kinsman or his particular friend. The last thing he thought of was to go from store to store to see where supplies could be bought most cheaply. Such conduct was too vacillating for the

straightforward farmer. "When I see what I want I buy it, and don't run off to another store to see if I can get it a cent cheaper." To be sure, of two articles which would serve the purpose the "cheapest" was apt to be chosen.

The storekeeper required traits somewhat different from those of the farmer. He was apt to be the son of a storekeeper or a youth who had taken to clerking because he did not like farming. There was a general feeling that rearing on a farm did not fit a boy for storekeeping, and when a farmer's boy became a successful storekeeper the general verdict was that "he has done mighty well for a farmer boy." Successful storekeeping required shrewdness in buying goods, care in keeping accounts, a smooth and pleasing address—attitudes that farming did not foster. However, the successful storekeeper in a rural community understood the rural attitudes and observed them in his behaviour. He was a man of honour, honesty, truthfulness, and of fellow-feeling in his relations with customers. His fellow-feeling sometimes involved him in difficulty for it inclined him to give credit liberally. At the same time he had the farmer's independence. "If a man doesn't want to trade with me he doesn't need to."

Two rival storekeepers let each other severely alone and tried to keep up an appearance of indifferent goodwill when they met. Each would show the other that he was not in the least disturbed by the other's competition. Each conducted his business with the utmost independence so far as the other was concerned. Occasionally, however, competition encouraged bitter feelings. As children in their play suddenly become in earnest and begin to fight, so occasionally two rival storekeepers became in earnest in their dislike and it was difficult to tell just how it came about. Each had his own explanation. This tense relation might last for years and neither would have anything to do with the other, either in a business way or socially.

The Doctor

The farmer's interest was in the creation of wealth. He enjoyed nothing so much as seeing his crops grow and come to maturity. The doctor's interest was in his patients. He enjoyed nothing so much as seeing a patient improve. The leading purpose of the farmer involved material results, and the constant dwelling on a material

result stimulated the acquisitive disposition. That of the doctor involved a non-material result, so the acquisitive disposition was not stimulated in the course of the practice of his profession. For this as well as other reasons the doctor was a poor collector.

The doctor was sometimes also a farmer; or he owned a farm and let it to a tenant. But his main business was diagnosing illness and his main interest was in seeing his patients improve. Like the farmer he was a man of action, but unlike him his action was not concerned with production of material things. Neither the farmer nor the doctor was concerned primarily with money. The farmer was concerned with the process of work and its result in crops; the doctor, in so far as he gave any thought to the material side of his business, was concerned with making a living, not with making money. Nothing in the young doctor of to-day so repels the doctor who is animated by the old-time attitudes as the young doctor's emphasis or the pecuniary side of his vocation.[2] The change is due to the influence of village and city life, with its wealthy business men and its emphasis on material prosperity.

The old rural doctor might have had a much larger income if he had been as interested in collecting his pay as he was in doctoring the sick. Among many families it was customary to pay the doctor once a year. Other families "were always going to pay but never got to it." The farmer was more reluctant to pay this debt than some others. Because he was intent on the production of material things he was unable to appreciate the worth of services. And because the service, though invaluable, was exceptional, the farmer was not in the habit of recognizing it. Being a creature of habit and not of reflection, or even of recollection, particularly if the thing to be recollected was the unpleasant experience of illness, he was lax in paying his doctor's bill. Another illness in the family would remind him of his unpaid bill, and the service at the moment would seem invaluable and he would mention his intention to pay "after harvest." Then other more pressing demands would dim the recollection of this one. The doctor understood the farmer; he knew he was all right "at heart" and that he (the doctor) was the most deeply regarded man in the community. The tendency in the early days was to have a family physician and swear by him. This was one manifestation of the tendency to loyalty which we see also in family, political and religious behaviour. The doctor was relied on as a friend in need and also as counsellor in business matters, such as taking out insurance and investing money. The

doctor was, thus, a unique figure in the community. Materially the most ill-used man, he was the most esteemed as a friend in need. When he died he had "the biggest funeral in the town in years" and the sorrow was heart-felt.

The doctor had many of the attitudes of the farmer. He was primarily a man of action. His practice extended over a wide territory, and he could not give directions by telephone, as to-day. His active life left no time for study even if he had the inclination. His knowledge was limited, remedies were few and scientific interest lacking. In the new country doctors were scarce and the state could not be too particular as to their qualifications. For a long time there was no state supervision of medical practice. The diploma from a medical school served as a doctor's license. The course in the schools was one of two terms of six months' duration each. The school was dependent on students' fees so that it made the course easy in order to get students. This lack of thorough education was against progress in medicine. So the doctor, like the farmer, was a man of action and of pronounced adherence to custom.

Like the farmer, he was also independent. He was not called except in cases of serious illness. If he was attached to the family he was a good nurse. But usually his treatment was rough and ready. He adopted the farmer's rough and ready attitude. He gave his directions brusquely. Sometimes one sees to-day a doctor of this old type. He is brusque, wastes no words, never calls twice when once is enough. His sole interest is in his case. He is distinct from the more polite, sophisticated product of later conditions. Another rural attitude of the doctor was that of making light of illness. He understood the prevailing attitude to endure pain rather than to try to escape it. He could rely on that attitude. This reliance was conspicuous in his practice of dentistry. Many rural communities had no dentist. The doctor pulled the teeth. The patient sat in an ordinary arm chair and was told to take a tight grip on the arms and hold on. Then the doctor gripped the tooth with his forceps, braced one foot against the seat of the chair, and placed his free hand against the patient's forehead. In spite of this the chair was sometimes pulled over the floor a bit before the tooth was extracted, for the farmer never lost his grip on the chair nor the doctor his grip on the tooth. At the close of one of these operations, when the patient had been hauled part way across the room, he is said to have remarked, as he took out his wallet, "Well, doctor, how much for the ride?"

"Oh, two shillings, I guess, for a short haul."

The doctor had many other attitudes of the farmer. He was a man of honour, courage and generosity. He braved any storm to reach a family in need. The fact that the family owed him money did not deter him.

The farmer felt the mysterious forces of nature co-operating with him. To the doctor, also, there was mystery in the response of the human body to his remedies. The superstition as to the ability of the seventh son to heal by the laying on of hands was widespread and a seventh son was much in demand. This encouraged seventh sons to become doctors. The bone-setter of extraordinary skill was regarded as having some supernatural power. And, so regarded, he came to think so himself.

A doctor in prescribing remedies had to consider the attitudes of the farmer. For instance, a young doctor who did not know these attitudes advised a farmer who was troubled with indigestion to "rest a little after eating." To the farmer who was habitually at his work again almost before the clatter of knives and forks had ceased this was a ridiculous proposition. It was passed over the town that "All Dr. E—— does is to tell you to rest after eating." Dr. E—— did not get much practice in that community. Again, the farmer was a man who wanted his money's worth, and he expected the doctor to give medicine. So, when he thought no medicine was necessary, the doctor gave sugar pills or poured a little coloured solution into a glass of water.

My purpose, in showing the effect of rural attitudes on the doctor's behaviour, is to point out that the professional man is not by his so-called "professional spirit" made impervious to the influence of the community. The rural doctor was not conscious of this influence any more than the city physician of to-day is conscious of it. But, in both city and country, outside influences affect professional behaviour.

The Lawyer

The lawyer followed the settler to adjust disputes over titles to land and over boundary lines, and to try cases of assault and slander that arose among a pugnacious population. These rural lawyers were more learned in a knowledge of the human nature with which they had to deal than in the law. For, owing to the tendency of the legal pro-

fession to limit the number of apprentices who might study law in the offices of lawyers and to impose a long apprenticeship,[3] there developed, in addition to the attorneys-at-law who had served their apprenticeship and had been regularly admitted to practice, a class of attorneys-in-fact, that is, lawyers who had not been admitted to practice but had read a little law and had begun to practice. Of course they could practice only in the lower courts. This class of lawyers was found throughout the rural districts. Their limited knowledge of the law did not jeopardize their practice, for the successful practitioner was one who understood not only the simple law involved but also the attitudes of the farmer; for most cases were tried before a jury of farmers. Furthermore, the farmers often chose one of their own number as town justice. The successful rural lawyer was one who grasped the justice of a case as it would appear to the typical farmer, and who was clever in finding a rule of law under which he could get justice. In his cogitations what he considered was the customary ways in which the people carried on their occupations and incurred their obligations; what expectations could reasonably be raised in a particular case in view of the customary ways of doing things; what was the customary meaning of the language employed by one man in dealing with another; what were the customary motives in dealings. His interest was in deciding a case justly in accordance with law and, particularly, with custom. Farmers were generally opposed to new laws. "Enforce what laws we have" was a maxim that was in accord with the farmer's tendency to action. The lawyers, likewise, were opposed to legislation, not only because of their predilection for the common law, as opposed to statutes, but also because they were influenced by the farmer's attitude against new laws. Their legal setness was accentuated by their reaction against the impulsiveness of people who were intent on satisfying their impulses customary to the law. To the lawyer the law was something to hold over people and the thing to do was not to talk of changing it but to enforce it as it stood.

We have seen that the manufacturer and storekeeper, the doctor and lawyer all had attitudes that characterized the farmers among whom they lived. They acquired these attitudes as children and developed them in the course of their business and social relations with the farmers. The result was less sense of antagonism between the different classes in the rural districts than in the city. The people

of the rural community knew one another more intimately than in the city. Also, in the city men of different occupations were thrown more exclusively with one another. Their characters were more specialized along occupational lines. The result was somewhat less sympathy between different economic groups than in the country.

CHAPTER XIII

ATTITUDES OF SOCIAL INTERCOURSE

THE economic equality of the early neighbourhood accentuated the attitude of social equality and goodwill. The goodwill obtained among all families which were economically independent. There was a feeling of some contempt for families that occasionally needed aid and of a decided aversion for the chronically dependent. Some farmers, also, had little respect for the merely industrious man who, because of poor judgment, never got ahead. But, fundamentally, there were only two social classes, the independent and the dependent. It was a disgrace to have to accept private charity, and still worse to "come on the town." In injunctions to children to be more industrious one of the phrases quite generally used was, "If you don't get down to work you'll land in the poorhouse." This abhorrence of dependence was an incentive to industriousness and those who were unavoidably poor tried to conceal their need.

While all independent families were not regarded as equals, all who were independent were apt to be workers and, as such, were socially esteemed. Not wealth but wealth-producing qualities of character were the measure of one's stature as a man before the community. The stories which old residents used to tell with greatest satisfaction were stories of feats of work—the number of acres of oats cradled in a day, the number of cords of wood chopped, of hop poles set. A farmer did not boast of a feat for his fellows disliked boasting. But he casually mentioned it in a way to "get credit" for it. Not all mighty workers were successful farmers. Farming required judgment as well as strength and skill. But all successful farmers were workers.

There were various attitudes toward the successful. There were men who were "too jealous" to admit the success of a neighbour. On the other hand there were men who recognized success with unaffected generosity because it was won by work. In some communities this was the prevailing attitude. Let one disparage the success of an unpopular fellow townsmen and he would meet with the short re-

joinder: "He's done well; give him his just deserts." Provided a man was a worker, the fact of superior wealth did not alienate him from his neighbours. Thus a poor farmer said of a well-to-do neighbour: "You bet that fellow's a worker and not stuck up either —just as common as you or I." And the well-to-do farmer had the same fellow-feeling toward his poorer neighbour. There was, however, a feeling of superiority over a hired man on the part of the independent farmer, even though the hired man was a mighty worker. This sense of superiority did not take the form of aloofness but the independent farmer would not himself work for another for wages. As we have seen he preferred to help the other and then have the other help him. The attitude toward the hired man was merely that he worked for another and was not independent. However, the farmer had a fellow-feeling for his hired man not seen later. Said an old farmer: "I have our hired man eat with us and sit with us in the sitting room in the evening. We never thought of doing differently in the old days. If a man is good enough to work for me he is good enough to eat with me."

This sense of all being subject to the common lot was, next to the sense of individual liberty, the most cherished aspect of early rural life. It was not a sense of personal equality, but that no one in virtue merely of accident of birth was socially superior to another. Each felt that all had to work and to endure the hardships of the common lot. What counted were a man's qualities as a worker, his initiative, persistence, endurance, ingenuity. The personally superior man was admired and acknowledged to be superior. Men believed in social, not personal equality. This sense of social equality and personal inequality continued until well on into the second period. It showed itself in a disregard of whatever social inequalities might exist and a respect for men and women for what they were personally. People were more frank and at ease with one another regardless of their social station than in a later period. There was, thus, a prevailing good humour and much unconscious, uncultivated politeness.

Along with this fellow-feeling between workers there was also an attitude contrary to it, more marked in some communities than in others but everywhere in evidence. And it became much more pronounced in the second period. It was an attitude of contempt for the man who was a worker but not a very successful farmer. At first the work was largely that of clearing the land and this was the time when mere

brawn counted for most, and when the equality of all workers was most strongly felt. When the land had been cleared it was possible to produce and accumulate. The activity of the neighbourhood more and more assumed the aspect of a hard rivalry in accumulation. Success now required good judgment as well as strength and skill. The goal was to own a farm and to have it entirely paid for. Such farmers were called "comfortable farmers" because their farms were paid for and they could take some comfort. These in a way constituted a class that was looked up to. A comfortable farmer was apt to have a little money to lend instead of borrowing from somebody else. On the other hand, the farmer who did not accumulate was contemned as a ne'er do well, a good worker, perhaps, but lacking in judgment. He might be the hardest and most patient of workers but he was contemned just the same. If he did not keep his debts paid this was an added reason for saying mean things about him. Successful men condemned a farmer who was inclined to be easy with an unsuccessful man in his debt. The successful took pride in their success and often seemed to derive a certain satisfaction in contemning the unsuccessful. And this without any generous allowances for a man's having a sick wife or other misfortune. This attitude became more pronounced in the second period. It rested on the belief that a farmer's prosperity depends entirely on himself—on his own exertions. This belief has so obsessed the farmer that he has with great reluctance been brought to admit that outside circumstances may affect the farmer's prosperity, for instance, low prices of farm products, monopoly resulting in high priced farm machinery, or a corrupt government resulting in excessive taxes.

We have, then, the two attitudes, the one that a man must be a worker, the other that he must be a successful farmer to have the entire respect of the community. As time went on the emphasis on success, as compared with mere industry, increased. But there still lingered the respect for the mere worker. Although, because of sickness or other misfortune, he might need help to tide him over a hard winter, yet, if he was industrious, his poverty would be excused on the ground that "he tries hard enough." The conspicuously successful might sneer at the poor, hard-working man but there was always the tendency of those who were less successful to sympathize with the unfortunate, because their own success was only moderate; from the point of view of social superiority and prestige they had failed as well as their poorer brethren.

Only the successful ever claimed that a man's success was in proportion to his deserts. "As a matter of fact it might be and it might not" was the general opinion. A man's success might be due to mere luck. "Once a man gets a start and money makes money." So there developed a feeling that the successful "ought to share" with the poor when the poor were in need. As success was apt to be due partly to good luck and partly to the fact that money makes money, so failure was apt to be due partly to bad luck and to lack of the necessary capital. This attitude that the successful "ought to share" prompted philanthropic people to approach the moneyed men of the community on behalf of the poor. Men who did not respond were put down as stingy and there was a great deal of giving in order to avoid this reputation. These attitudes are more pronounced in American than in European nations, because of our democratic rural traditions, which is one reason for the American faith in mere philanthropy,[1] as opposed to progress by the organization of workmen for self-help through economic and political action.

The socially esteemed class in the early community was the workers; the contemned class included those who were intermittently industrious or entirely shiftless, who failed to keep their buildings and fences in repair, to have their work done in season and to support their families well. However, no matter how worthless a man might be, he and his family were not allowed to starve. The occasional tramp was fed and allowed to sleep in the barn. In the case of an unknown tramp found dead in a barn, there was widespread expression of regret that "someone did not know about it in time." There was no operation of the law of natural selection in the strict sense of the term, even in this rigorous period of rural development, for there was no perishing of the unfit from starvation. But the heavy work impaired the health of the weaker, and the suppression of normal impulses under the requirement of extreme self-denial was not conducive to the soundest mental health. The essential social process was not a struggle for existence but a struggle to live according to the customary standard of the community. This involved providing for the family, paying for the place, laying by a little for a rainy day, making a modest contribution to the church, and providing suitable entertainment whenever friends happened to drop in. Living respectably included, also, living according to the moral ideas of the community. These were not merely an inheritance from the past but, for the most part, were vitally related to the farmer's economic life. Essential in

that was action, unflagging industry, and abhorrence of laziness. Note the habitual shamefacedness of the loafer and the apologetic attitude of the man who, because he was old, or was recovering from an illness, was permanently or temporarily idle. Industry was the rule, it was "in the air," and the man who was not temperamentally active yielded to the social suggestion without knowing it and thus added his influence to the general contempt for laziness. In the villages, on the other hand, there developed among those who did not have to work with their hands a contempt for those who did. Because of this the young farmer did not like to come to town and peddle his produce in his old clothes. Those in the villages who felt above manual work seized opportunities to display their aboveness. For instance, a householder, instead of mowing his little lawn after business hours, would hire it done and stand idly by to "boss the job." When the working virtues—industriousness, persistence, endurance, thrift—ceased to be socially esteemed, those virtues less directly associated with the economic life also weakened—self-restraint, honour, honesty, sincerity, generosity.

Not only the virtues but also the pleasures of the farmer were largely an outgrowth of his active life. This gave him a vigorous appetite. He was proud of his appetite as one of his strong points, and young farmers when they came together on festive occasions would test their capacity, as on General Training Day, when there were contests as to who could eat the most roast pig. Aside from eating the farmer did not greatly emphasize material comforts. His rough garments, unpretentious dwelling, unadorned table and rude vehicles gave an observer used to refinement in material surroundings an impression of crudeness but the farmer was satisfied. As his pecuniary condition improved, his wife added new furniture, carpets and dishes. He bought a new carriage and his daughters had music lessons. However, it was not in the newly furnished parlour but in the old-fashioned sitting room that the farmer took solid comfort.

Outdoor sports had a prominent place in the pleasures of the neighbourhood. Wherever boys or men assembled there were displays of physical prowess. Rough games and fights during recess at school, contests at "pulling stick" between neighbourhoods on town-meeting day, show a pugnacious and physically exuberant population. The rivalry between sturdy youths as to whom could husk the most corn or set the most hop poles, the wrestling matches in the barn on rainy days, the rude horseplay as one neighbour passed another's house on

the country road, these frequent trials of strength and of rough wit resulted in an unfeigned admiration for the powerful man. With this was associated a love of fair play which might show which really was the powerful man.

In these rough pleasures the whole neighbourhood frequently joined. There were raisings, bees and socials. On all these occasions there was a hearty meal, before and after which the young folks played blind man's buff, while the old folks visited, compared notes about daily work, cracked jokes, propounded conundrums or exchanged local gossip. Another popular pleasure was the singing school which the neighbourhood held weekly during the winter months in its schoolhouse, or united with other neighbourhoods in holding in the schoolhouses of each in turn. Singing schools may not be regarded as pleasures of physical activity unless it is recollected that those of the early days were more or less refined contests as to which could make the loudest noise.

Once or twice a year the entire community held a "jollification." The greatest of these festive occasions was General Training Day. On this day, which came in September, every able-bodied man between the ages of fifteen and forty-five was required by law to take part in military exercises. There was a parade, a sham battle, roast pig at the taverns and a masquerade ball in the evening. Except for these annual festivals and for the assembling of the community at church on Sunday, association for pleasure was limited to the neighbourhood. There was, however, more or less constant intercourse between neighbourhoods. In addition to the visiting between families there were certain community characters who carried "the news" from neighbourhood to neighbourhood. In our typical community these included. "Old Buckley," the shoemaker, who lived in a log cabin and carried his bench from house to house and made shoes for all the family; Vine Bailey, the old clock-mender, who "would sit down and talk for an hour, then take a pinch of snuff and tinker away on the clock, talking all the time"; Mrs.——, the dressmaker, who was in great demand at all times, particularly in preparations for weddings and funerals. These community characters conveyed the gossip from one neighbourhood to another. However, association between neighbourhoods was less intimate than was association between neighbours. The latter was entirely informal; the "women folks" visited back and forth whenever there was a lull in the morning's work and they had some spicy gossip to relate; and longer calls were frequent and made with-

out special invitation. As one old resident said, "I used to take the baby in one arm and some knitting in the other and go over to the neighbour's and stay all the afternoon and to supper. We went back and forth whenever we felt like it without waiting to be asked." The social life of the men was equally informal. The farmers congregated at the tavern or store in the evening and indulged in arguments, jokes and horseplay.

This social pleasure of the early period differed from that which later centred in the village in this, that the former was conspicuously that of an active people while the latter implied an inactive, sophisticated type. In the first period the pleasures were more largely bodily pleasures—the hearty laugh, the hearty meal, the rustic dance in which the boy "did not hold the girl at arm's length and both went into it for dear life so that the shouting and clatter drowned out the music." In the second period, the jovial farmer was found to be "too noisy" on festive occasions—"haw-hawing so that you could hear him away out into the street." His jokes were declared too coarse, his stories and homely wit too slow. So the laugh was modulated and not a spontaneous guffaw, the tables were less "loaded down" and more tastefully decorated, the dancers were more artistic in dress and step than exuberant in movement.

There was in this early period a pronounced feeling of difference between the country and the village. The life of the farmer was a life of action, as compared with the sedentary occupations of the village. His habits of action unfitted him for village life and most farmers were inclined to keep out of the village and to continue to live on the farm to the last. The farmer judged villagers from the point of view of his own attitudes which were so different from those of village people that misunderstanding was inevitable.

The difference between village and country in the matter of action goes to explain other differences also. Village people were more given to gossip than those on the farms because the farmer's family had less time for gossip. The rural telephone has increased gossiping on the farm but the village probably holds the record. If a farmer and his wife move to town, however, they easily become infected with this tendency. The farmer now spends his time sitting around the house "waiting for his funeral," and one cannot blame him for preferring the nail keg and the gossip of the country store. And the wife, thus deprived of his solemn company, is quite apt to spend a good deal of time at a neighbour's on a similar errand. The sociable attitude

prompts people to "make talk" and the more interesting the talk the more successful the social hour. Hence the main tendency of gossip —to say something interesting without very strict regard to its accuracy. People find this pleasure in reading newspapers, wherefore the papers are not held by their readers to a very high standard of accuracy. Because of the isolation of the rural community there were few things to talk about and this caused a tendency to exaggeration in gossip. Sickness or trouble in a family was "made out worse than it was." At the same time, in some communities at least, there were certain things that people did not gossip about. If a person had once done something "awful," either recently or in the dim past, it would be generally known that he or she had done so but nobody would tell an inquirer what had been done. Extreme wrongdoing was "wicked" and the awfulness of sin caused people to fear to talk of the worst sins. Also there was a strong bond between neighbours which caused a neighbour to protect another's reputation. On the other hand family feuds occasionally gave gossip a tendency to be bitter and relentless and to stop at no scandal. Always, however, along with the enjoyment of scandal there was a contempt for the scandal monger. Hence the apologetic air, even of the worst gossiper.

The small village never had much attraction for enterprising boys and girls reared on the farm. Their goal was the city. Even in this early period, the young people were beginning to get restive and many of them were eager to get off the farm and go to the city. The lure of the city as the place to try one's fortune, the rumoured pleasures and distractions of the city and the ease with which people made a living there as compared with the hard life on the farm were the main inducements. Then too the idea became widespread that to succeed in the city was a greater achievement than merely success as a farmer. Furthermore, many people were not suited to country life. A person must feel quite self-sufficient physically, mentally and morally, not to be lonely there. His domestic and neighbourly relations must be fairly happy. Young people especially were apt to feel the family and neighbourhood restraint and to long for the reputed freedom of the city. Migration of young people to the cities became noticeable in the 'forties and increased after the Civil War. The young were thus more or less alienated from their former homes. The old folks back home were likely to be more or less neglected. In the 'fifties this subject received magazine attention. The young man in the

city was reluctant to visit his folks in the country; it was too dull there; they wanted him to stay too long; he did not go as often as he could.[2]

The isolation and loneliness of rural life caused the people to make the most of the means of relaxation they had. As they had to rely on themselves in their work so did they in their relaxation. This situation led to the cultivation of humour and to a high valuation of the humorous man. It led also to the cultivation of kindliness and to an unfeigned esteem of kindly people. However, capacity for the cultivation of these social qualities depended on the character of the individual. Some farmers had a pronounced tendency toward optimism —in the uncertainty of the seasons they always hoped for the best— and this attitude, in their social relations, expressed itself in a tendency to think well and to expect well of others. Even toward strangers this type of farmer was ordinarily interested and hospitable. Other farmers had a pronounced tendency toward pessimism both in their economic and their social life. Needless to say it was the optimistic and cheery farmer who was socially esteemed and this social esteem was, in turn, a strong incentive to the cultivation of optimism and cheeriness. The result was that the social pleasure of the early time was pervaded by a fellow-feeling and goodwill and a sense of humour not found later. This was accentuated by the absence of the attitude of contemptuous exclusiveness that comes with economic inequality. This developed particularly in the villages, where the increasing inequality of a later period resulted in subservience to the wealthy, which was manifested particularly at social functions. This gave functions a decorous atmosphere because of the anxiety to accord the social leaders the deference due them in virtue of their assured social position. But in the early days it did not seem to occur to anyone who was "better off" than a neighbour that this gave him or her an assured social position. Even if some families were not obliged to work so hard as others, yet all were liable to loss in bad seasons, and, more important still, all were liable to suffering through accident, sickness and bereavement. In case of sickness or accident the well-to-do were as dependent on the poor as were the poor on the well-to-do. No trained nurse could be secured by the next train; the proferred assistance of the poor man's wife was gratefully accepted and she watched by the bedside of her well-to-do neighbour's child while the tired mother gained some rest.

Not only in sickness and bereavement but also in the ups and downs of everyday life the help and sympathy of neighbours was welcome,

The monotony of life was most pleasantly broken by dropping in for a chat with a neighbour and by having the neighbours drop in. Hence the solicitude in case of a change of neighbours as to whether the new neighbours would be "good people," that is, congenial in the intimate and many-sided neighbourly relations. The favourites in those days were the men rich in humour and neighbourliness. In our typical town these favourites included Tom Kiness, an Indian, whose homely wit and sly humour made him a favourite at all social functions; H—— T——, the jolly toll-gate keeper with a cheery greeting for everybody; I—— B——, great-hearted farmer, who, on Sunday, hitched his team to his big wagon and took the whole neighbourhood to church. "He was always ready with a bushel of potatoes for the poor and didn't want the whole town to know it"; "never pressed an honest debtor, never picked a quarrel and never held a grudge." It is this cheeriness, forbearance and ready helpfulness which is meant by that succinct eulogy of the departed: "He was a good neighbour."

CHAPTER XIV

THE HUMOROUS ATTITUDE

THE habit of easing troubles and perplexity by means of humour was well developed among the rural population. People who could thus "make light of" their troubles and ease those of others were highly regarded. Humour is the association with a serious state of mind of some trivial idea. The association relaxes the serious state and the sudden reduction of tension may cause the reflexes of relaxation that we term smiling and laughter. Not everything that causes laughter is humorous, for instance, a misplaced emphasis on a syllable of a word. If a person makes such a mistake unintentionally we laugh but not at his humour. However, any clever use of words or association of ideas that irresistibly reduces the serious to the trivial may be called humorous. The more perfect and obvious the association, the more hearty the humour.

Several conditions of the early rural community were favourable to humour. One of these was the economic and social equality and comradeship of neighbours and the practice of getting together for social intercourse. In those days people did not have the means of recreation they have to-day and they had to make their own amusement. As a farmer used his wits when a machine broke down because he had to in order to get the work done, so men cultivated humour because they were thrown so much on their own resources for relaxation. And there was as sincere and hearty admiration for the humorist as for the mechanical genius.

Another condition that made for humour was the tendency to ridicule pretensions to superiority. The farmer was keen in detecting and sometimes too ready to suspect such pretensions. Certain classes of men, whose occupations inevitably involved pretensions to leadership, particularly tempted to humorous sallies, but they must be men whom people did not hesitate to take in this humorous vein. For instance, the clergyman had serious pretensions and so he was particularly apt to be made the subject of humorous remarks by "sinners." But church members frowned on this; they "tried not to laugh" at

a naïve remark of a child about the minister. The lawyer, also, was by occupation somewhat assertive and was made the butt of humour.

The rural neighbourhood was a group of equals among whom a sort of primitive comradeship prevailed, as compared with the "uppishness" of the villages in which economic inequality was developing. So the essential tendencies of social relationship between families in the neighbourhood were different from those of the village with its growing tendency to adulation on the part of the socially inferior and pride on the part of the superior. For instance, the farmer "spoke to" everybody he met, whether he knew him or not, and he expected everybody to speak to him. In the village the inferior would not venture to speak to some of the superior; the superior would be annoyed by this familiarity. On this background of comradeship of the neighbourhood the uppishness of the village stood out as laughable, while, on the background of the assertive-submissive relationship of the village, the comradely manners of the farmer caused a laugh among the villagers. Each group found what was contrary to its conventional behaviour to be humorous, but the farmer had the advantage in that his comradeship relation was more favourable to a humorous attitude than the village relation. The assertive individual, conscious of his own importance, endeavoured to maintain this serious state of mind and would not let himself go in humour. Assertive people sometimes "try to be funny" but fail because, though what they say may be funny, their attitude is contrary to a humorous state of mind. Submissiveness and adulation are likewise contrary to humour.

While the primitive comradeship of the early neighbourhood was favourable to humour, the strenuous life was against it. The humour of working hours was apt to incline to the ridicule with which the strenuous farmer strove to quicken the movements of a slow worker. But at the close of the day the jovial man had his inning and no one was so much in demand as he whose quaint humour took the sharpness and weariness out of life. The difference between the quality of the humour of the working hours, as compared with that of relaxation, was akin to the difference between the contemptuous laugh and the jovial, good-natured laugh. Only the latter is genuine laughter. On Sunday the religious attitude repressed humorous inclinations. Nevertheless there were certain neighbourhood characters who ignored the strenuous and the religious attitudes and let themselves go in humour about as they pleased, though mindful of certain forbidden subjects of humour.

When we turn to the subjects of humour it is evident that the variety of these depends on the imagination and the cleverness of the humorist as well as on the attitudes of the people. Religious symbols were by common consent removed from the sphere of humour, but there were unusual humorists who were given a certain freedom in this direction. Also the tendency was for the public to frown on the humorous treatment of celebrities who were taken seriously. But here again cleverness enabled a humorist to go a long way.

Privately many people indulged in humorous comments on religious subjects and on celebrities, which they would have frowned on if made publicly. Those who laugh privately are quite apt publicly to make the socially approved obeisances. Indeed, humour is the special privilege of a private social circle. Only there does a man enjoy the privilege of honest criticism and humorous comment. In public he feels he must take the attitudes of the public; in private he can be himself. Now there was one condition that made for humour in the early rural community, and that was the large place that a man's private life occupied in his total life. His farm was his little world, his home was his castle and he was by himself on his farm and in his home most of the time. In the leisure hours of the fall and winter, the neighbours came to his home and he went to theirs and this companionship of a few intimate equals put the individual in that expansive mood of relaxation in which the mind naturally plays with superficial associations. Conversely, humour was more or less consciously cultivated to promote that sociability that relieved from the monotony of an isolated life.

To-day rural people are less isolated and more with the public in their amusements. They are less dependent on their own resources for relaxation. In so far as they take part in the social life of the villages they are influenced by the village attitudes. In the social clubs of the villages, even in the theatres and concerts there is a seriousness on the part of those who have a sense of their superiority as well as on the part of those who recognize it. Wherefore, there is more social life but less sociability then formerly. This is particularly true in the villages but the village atmosphere has had an effect on the rural districts. Neighbours are less dependent on each other than formerly. They are less sociable and less inclined to humour. They do not have to be humorous in order to enjoy relaxation for they have the auto, the moving pictures and the village social life. They seldom sit down together for a social time. If they do they must be doing something,

playing cards, for instance. People seem to be too well informed to talk agreeably with one another and not well enough informed to talk freely. They are not sincere enough to receive information without embarrassment and to give it without fear of being thought bumptious. This is due to the overweening rivalry of social life which finds vent in card playing and other competitive games, in competitive dressing, competitive conversation, competitive speech-making, competitive philanthropy. Because of rivalry people cannot talk sociably and humorously. Rivalry has given a discretion, a reserve, a furtiveness, an interested motive to social intercourse that interferes with the disinterested free play of humour.

Certain phases of rivalry are somewhat humorous, for instance, conspicuous or false pretensions to superiority—as the grammatical errors of one who pretends to unusual learning, and the loud dressing and the pretentious and profusely ornamented homes of those who display their wealth. The superficiality of the climbers sometimes impresses spectators humorously. But the social rivalry that emanates from the villages weakens the old rural inclination to treat pretensions humorously. Noticeable pretensions are so treated but when pretence becomes general, pretensions are less and less noticeable and so are apt to be taken seriously instead of humorously, and people who make sport of them are apt to be called "mean-spirited." The proper spirit is that of a punctilious regard for the social rivalry of the place.

There was rivalry in the early neighbourhood but it was a rivalry in personal superiority, was largely incidental to the day's work and was not conventionalized as was the case when the standards of superiority had become largely material. Gradually there developed in the villages a class of manufacturers, dealers in farm produce, merchants and professional men who came to be recognized as superior because of their wealth or political influence. And their prestige extended even into the rural districts because they "put the town on the map." That is, the entire community, village as well as rural parts, was given a superior position in that section of the state because of these local celebrities. As soon as this community pride had developed, the men who were the factors in giving the community a manifest superiority became the objects of a serious adulation. The community paper, when referring to these men, instead of using first names or nicknames as heretofore and couching the reference in a jocular style, gave the full name and the story was written in a vein of serious adulation.

The adulation was more pronounced in the paper than it was felt by the people, and it was more marked among village people than in the rural parts but even there it was noticeable. Thus social rivalry and adulation of the superior weakened the humorous attitude.

Another cause of weakening humour was the passing of economic independence. The early farmer was poor but independent because land was cheap and his wants were few. He lived in a log house or a cheap frame house and required few utensils and tools. This independent man felt free and easy and was inclined to give free play to humour. He was constantly assailing with his humour the man who showed any pride or self-conceit. This attitude was seen also in the family, where parents noticed the effect of praise on their children and were quick to correct conceit. So people were generally in the habit of giving rather stinted praise and of wearing down, by humour, any noticeable inclination toward a big head. Then came a change in economic conditions. Land rose in value, those who bought farms incurred debt, farm tenants began to appear, dependence on the money lender and the landlord increased. Farmers farmed more extensively, needed more supplies, bought more on credit, and dependence on the village merchant spread. In the village dependence of workmen on employers developed. Because of increasing competition merchants felt less independent of customers, more eager to please. Thus everywhere there was an increase of relations of dependence; at the same time the humorous attitude weakened throughout the population. But it survived longest in the rural neighbourhoods. The unusually successful farmer found that he was differently treated in the village after he moved there than he had been in the rural neighbourhood. One who moved to the village and began buying farm produce and kept an account at the bank was called Henry by the banker and by his village friends, but to his old associates from the country whom he happened to meet on the street he was "just Hank."

While the increasing rivalry and economic dependence have weakened the humorous attitude there are some new conditions that tend to stimulate it. In the early days the population was extremely conventional and the laugh was on the unconventional person. The humour was of the obvious kind, lacking in imagination and subtlety. The new ideas and new ways of doing of a later period unsettled conventionality and disposed to a willingness to laugh at humorous sallies which before would have been resented. The humorist might now play with personages and ideas formerly forbidden. The break-

up of social conventions widens the range of possible subjects of humour.

A period of weakening conventions finds a counter tendency, however, in the seriousness of the social rivalry of the time. The break-up of conventions is apt to be due more to social rivalry than to anything else. This rivalry may stimulate a certain trend in social behaviour which, while on the surface not contrary to humour, really is so. This trend is most conspicuous in villages but affects the entire rural community. In villages and small cities there are various groups of people who expect their most conspicuous members to be counted among the first citizens of the community. Many families wish their heads to attain that recognition. Each church expects its clergyman to preach and advertise himself into it. The superintendent of schools or the principal is expected by the board of education so to commend himself to the public as to qualify for it. The bankers, manufacturers, merchants are expected to maintain such a standard of living as will qualify them for it. Any man of wealth or position who does not aspire to enter the circle of leading citizens and continues to live humbly is regarded as "lacking in spirit." These leading citizens may organize a social club. Then the aim of the ambitious men of the community is to get into the club. This club gets together once a week or once a month for a "feed." These are supposed to be occasions of fun and humour. The rules require it. The members make a serious effort to observe the rules. The rules prescribe comradeship. Each must call the other by his first name and joke a little. But the real spirit of the occasion is assertive. After the feed the members are told by the speakers that they are the leaders of the community. They feel the seriousness of their position. The organization takes itself and its fun seriously instead of making its seriousness a matter of humour. The rank and file of the members move and second the merriment of the fun-makers, and when the pretence gets on their nerves a spell-binder is brought in from some neighbouring town.

The democratic community, so-called, is made up of these various groups, none of them moved by any sense of equality or fellow-feeling, all of them under the urge of the impulse for superiority, each with its leader and local following. The following is just as serious as the leader. If the father has too much of the old rural sense of equality and humour to fancy the new social life, the wife and children endeavour to fire him with the proper spirit. The minister must not be jocose or indifferent about questions of precedence at

union services or public gatherings or about his due prominence in public undertakings or the respect due him on the occasion of civic celebrations. In like manner the other organizations do not allow their leaders to be humorous at the expense of the serious pretensions of the organization. The social rivalry of the place must be taken seriously. This insistent seriousness of the community discourages humour. The community is more serious and complex in its rivalries than it once was with, consequently, less play room for humour.

Because of the inhibiting effect of assertiveness and rivalry on humour, and because of the part played by the imagination in humour, the social conditions that encourage it are those which relieve from stress of social rivalry and stimulate the imagination. The village and small city presents the opposite of these necessary conditions while no environment better meets them than a rural community of intelligent people who know each other intimately and have a will to be friendly instead of assertive. Intelligent people have capacity of imagination and their rural environment gives them opportunity not only for social intercourse that stimulates imagination but also for the reflection and valuation of social standards that makes it possible to put social rivalry in its subordinate place. If anywhere you find people who are not blind devotees of the conventional system of social rivalry it is in the rural districts. Intelligent country people maintain their sense of opposition to the village in many of its attitudes and standards and those of social rivalry are among those most opposed. It is not a mere prejudiced opposition but, in the case of intelligent ruralites, is a product of reflection.

The background against which variations in ideas and behaviour appear humorous may be either the conventional background of the uncultured person or the reflective background of the cultured. The conventional person is inclined to laugh at the slightest variations from conventions, while the humour of the cultured is a matter of reflective background and of insight. The humorist must have, above everything else, a true philosophy of life. The larger his comprehension of the great society becomes, the more varied are his humorous reactions to the actual provincial society of which he is a part, until there is achieved the comprehension and humour of a Lincoln who, with his profound insight into social relations, developed an immense power of humour. The incidental result was his mastery of his own rivalrous disposition and the adjustment of it entirely to ideal requirements.[1]

CHAPTER XV

ATTITUDES OF INSTITUTIONAL RELIGION

THE early farmer was a religious man. These psychological conditions particularly made him so. First, his active life made him a man of strong impulses and religion served as a means of curbing unruly impulses and giving balance to personality. Second, the uncertainties, dangers and hardships of his lot made the consolations of religion sweet to him. "We'll have a long rest in heaven," was the way he reconciled himself to his weary outlook. Third, the injustices of life forced him to believe that "some day everything will be made right." Fourth, his contact with nature made him conscious of mystery in various processes. He liked to feel that the mystery was settled by the explanation that God did it. Now these different sources of religious feeling were not disconnected. Beliefs that strengthened and consoled him in his hardships and bereavements, as well as the belief in a day of judgment when things would be made right, derived plausibility from the mystery of life. God was believed in because the belief explained many mysterious things—the creation, the processes of history, the growth of crops, the future life, but particularly because the farmer could have God on his side in the battles of life, and also because the belief in God gave an incentive to the curbing of unruly impulses and was central in the idea of the judgment. The sense of mystery would have meant little had it not served as a means of making plausible those beliefs that relieved from the ever present sense of the hardships and injustices of life, and that inspired to self-control.

There were two religious types. One of these, to which most farmers belonged, included those who observed the conventional religious behaviour. They might be demonstrative or reserved in their behaviour but they were centred not on the cultivation of a spiritual life that was ethically excellent but on observing the traditional ceremonies, professing the traditional beliefs and showing in their behaviour those features that were conventionally accepted as the necessary distinctions between the worldly and the Christian man. This chapter

will be devoted to this conventional Christianity, that is, to institutional religion, and the next to the religion of those intent on the cultivation of a spiritual life.

The active life of the farmer worked against dwelling on the mystery of things. At the same time his close relation with nature brought him into contact with mysterious processes, and this gave him an attitude of reverence. This attitude was not very clearly conscious. Most farmers were matter of fact and were apt to dismiss any feeling of mystery except when it was suggested by the minister. One of the minister's favourite ways of arousing religious interest was, in walking with the farmer out to view his crops, to say, "Wonderful, isn't it! What makes it grow?" Of course the farmer expected him to say it, yet the mystery of things was kept alive by the suggestions and preaching of the minister. Without this the tendency was, except in the case of an unusually thoughtful farmer, for the attitude to nature to be entirely practical. It was a matter of planting and hoping for a favourable season. However, the occupation of the farmer gave the minister more to work on than did that of the artisan who works with mechanical forces, or that of the business man whose interest centres around price movements.

Because sense of mystery was essential in rural religion, the minister and the religious farmer were impatient with the scientific attitude that purported to explain the processes of nature according to natural law. In alliance with the farmer's religious attitude, against the scientific, was his pride. His long association with the soil and the growing crops seemed to him to belie anything about them that he did not know. Especially was his pride aroused when the scientific attitude was represented by some youthful student of biology or zoology who had been away to school. To-day progressive farmers are more scientific. They have become interested in soil textures, fertilizers, chemical and biological processes. Their children, home from school, are animated with the scientific attitude and it, rather than the religious, is the socially influential attitude. Nevertheless, the religious attitude persists. The mass of farmers have a somewhat cynical attitude toward mere scientific explanation. This is true of men who profess no religious belief and in spite of the increasing tendency to make use of the information dispensed in agricultural bulletins. Science is felt to be very useful but, says the farmer, "it can't help you out with the weather very much." It is impossible for one who is not in close touch with farm life to appreciate the farmer's dependence on

the weather. The predictions of the Weather Bureau are too general to meet local conditions invariably, and this impossibility of accurate forecasting discourages the application of scientific methods. Wherefore the scientific attitude is still weak among the rural population, and the conventional religious attitude persists.

The average farmer did not have the character of a mystic. He was too active and practical. Religion was for him a matter of certain necessary beliefs and practices rather than of a personal, mystical relation to the deity.[1] There were in certain parts of New York religious sects that emphasized the personal relation and there were everywhere spiritual men and women who cultivated it. But for the typical farmer the church represented religion and he was content to leave it to the minister to profess a personal relation to God. The religious interest of the farmer grew out of his practical activities. Bad seasons, bad luck and daily hardships might be little talked about but they gave experience a substratum of weariness, worry and disappointment. Experience made many farmers pessimistic. This attitude explains a good deal in the behaviour of farmers, for instance, their doubt about projects for the improvement of agricultural conditions. Now the power of religion lay in the fact that it diverted attention from the evils of life by prescribing the ceremonies through which the farmer could enlist God on his behalf. This essential aspect of religion was called special providence. Through special providence the season might be made favourable or adversity might be turned to the account of man's good in the long run.

This practical reliance on God on the part of the independent farmer is to be distinguished from fearful submission. As a religious attitude it is different from that of the devotee of an autocratic ecclesiastical system. Nevertheless, the farmer's practical reliance on God had an aspect of fear. The inclination to win God's help by observing certain prescribed ceremonies was, on its obverse side, a fear not to do so. So the religious man was termed a "God-fearing" man. Because the religious attitude involved a fearful sense of dependence, the farmer ordinarily was somewhat shamefaced in "professing" his religion. Self-respect required that a man be not afraid, that he depend on himself. However, not all farmers had this apologetic attitude in connection with religion. Occasionally in a church gathering the elders of the church took it upon themselves to expound religion. Because they were supposed to understand doctrine it was not humiliating for them to talk religion. They were not talking religion but doctrine.

Their talk sprang from their superior knowledge of doctrine. For the same reason it was not humiliating for the minister to talk religion. His motive in talking was not his sense of dependence but to glorify God as only he could by enlightening and stirring the emotions of his hearers. A man who could do this was regarded as "right smart." But he must not bring in any new doctrine. The elders would show such a young preacher that they knew what sound doctrine was. On one such occasion an elder arose to rebuke the minister and the parish never forgot it. "He just shut his eyes and began to talk and he didn't lack for words." He was not professing his religion but declaring sound doctrine. His assurance was in marked contrast to that of the more humble member who, in the after-meeting during a revival, in a few faltering phrases testified to his faith that the Lord was with him.

The independent life of the farmer somewhat minimized the third religious incentive mentioned in the first paragraph, that is, the need of believing that some day the injustices of life would be made right. This incentive is compelling in an oppressed population but less so among independent farmers. However, many a victim of a hard, shrewd man found comfort in the thought that God would punish him in the day of judgment. Many a wronged woman clung to the same belief. It functioned to relieve pent-up feelings when the law was powerless to achieve justice and forbade the taking of vengeance.

The practical farmer of the early days was not easy to convert because he was inclined to rely on his own strength. But the God-fearing attitude was prevalent. And, if social suggestion was not sufficient, some particularly depressing experience might give the necessary stimulus, for instance, a death in the family. This gave the matter-of-fact farmer a shuddering pause in his monotonous routine. Such a time was propitious for a religious awakening and the minister was not apt to be slow to take advantage of it. The natural attitude to death was one of shrinking, but religion gave assurance of a future life and a reunion with loved ones. Once having made his peace with God, the individual was at rest with regard to the future.

The typical farmer was practical rather than emotional or mystical in his religion. He wanted the help of God in a practical way and relied on formal religious observances to get it. Communities with this practical kind of religion sometimes were adjacent to communities characterized by emotional religion. Our typical town offers a case in point. In a preceding chapter the difference between its topography

and that of the hill town to the south was pointed out. There was also a difference in the religion of the two towns. The farmers of our typical town were extremely practical in their religion, while the town to the south was characterized by "crazy" religious conduct. The revivals of our town were as gentle zephers compared with the storm-swept town to the south. Itinerant preachers belonging to the Mormon, Perfectionist and Second Adventist sects preached in our town from time to time but with little effect. The town to the south, on the other hand, has been the scene of great camp meetings, frenzied revivals, and of Perfectionist and Second Adventist crazes. Stories of miraculous healing and of supernatural appearances were current there.[2] This difference in the religion of the two towns is due in part at least to economic conditions for, as shown in a previous chapter, the town to the south was more hilly and the land less valuable than much of the land of our typical town and the result was a shifting of the less efficient and more emotional farmers into the hill country to the south and of the more efficient and shrewd farmers into the fertile valley to the north.

The practical and the emotional religion had this in common that neither questioned the prevailing supernatural system. Emotional religion was sometimes fostered by practical clergymen as a means of combating a scientific attitude. Thus ministers maintained that "if you get thoroughly alive to the presence of the Holy Spirit you don't need to fear scepticism. The time the devil begins to suggest doubts is when you are spiritually dead." Thus there is no hard and fast line between emotional and practical religion. The practical farmer might get a little emotional during a revival. The point is that his religion was more a matter of observing certain ceremonies than of emotional experience.

The aspects of practical religion consisted of a profession and observance of the beliefs, the ceremonies and the Christian behaviour through which the help of God was to be secured. The essential ceremony was Sabbath-keeping and the necessary behaviour was called "godly behaviour." This ceremony and behaviour are emphasized in the vital portion of the covenant of the Presbyterian Church of our typical town, organized in 1823. "We engage to sanctify the Sabbath by laying aside all worldly employments at the time when we believe the Sabbath begins, and not to do any work, except it be of real necessity or mercy, until the Sabbath, including twenty-four hours, is ended. We will never forsake the assembling of ourselves together, but will con-

stantly attend the public worship of God on the Sabbath; we promise to renounce the world, the flesh and the devil, to be temperate in all things; to engage in no employment until we are convinced that it is not incompatible with duty, and to lead an industrious, sober, peaceable and godly life."

The essential religious observances were, then, abstinence from all unnecessary work on the Sabbath and attendance at church. Church attendance did not signify entire acceptance of the beliefs of the church. Even those who were not members of the church regularly attended. As one old resident who was not a "professing Christian" said: "We all tumbled into the lumber wagon and went to meeting as regularly as Sunday came. One would as soon have thought of not sitting down to dinner as of not going to meeting." There were several reasons for church attendance in addition to its significance as a ceremony of worship. For one thing it was the only occasion on which a good part of the community regularly got together. There was the enjoyment of being together, the handshaking and exchange of greetings after worship, the visiting of the women in the church and of the men outside. As two neighbouring families enjoyed a sociable time at the close of the day and felt this sociability indispensable to the enjoyment of complete relaxation, so going to church was a social occasion for the whole community at the end of the week's work. The old phrase "going to meeting" that was used instead of our "going to church" signified this function of church attendance as a meeting of the families of the community.

Of course the religious function of the church service was emphasized above its social function. It signified a due respect for God as creator and law-giver and giver of all good. The service had also a moral significance. It was the main expression of the moral unity of the group, the occasion on which the group was made conscious of its purpose to live according to the moral standards of the community. But the minister preached that it was not sufficient to live a moral life. One must recognize the divine lawgiver. It strengthened the tendency to "live true" to the attitudes and beliefs of the community to think of them as laws laid down by a divine lawgiver. Consequently the representative of this lawgiver was listened to with deep respect and the regret was correspondingly keen when some of the brethren felt that they could not follow him in all he declared, for instance, in an harangue against slavery. It was deemed unfortunate that a minister should take up secular matters instead of confining himself

to the lofty presentation of divine truth, in the acceptance of which there could be no difference of opinion.

Even more important than attendance at church was abstinence from work on Sunday. A man might not attend church, might, in fact, be inclined to Unitarianism or Spiritualism, and not arouse social indignation as long as he did not work on Sunday. The strong feeling of religious difference was that between the Christian and the infidel, the infidel being the man who, preaching the supremacy of natural law, dared to work on Sunday. Such an awful sin was "a slap in the face of the Almighty" and destined to bring speedy vengeance. A man who worked on Sunday or who indulged in week day pleasures on that day was felt to have a dangerously defiant attitude toward the moral standards of the community. He irritated his neighbours as one who had a disposition to disregard morality. Consequently people who disbelieved Christianity and did not attend church still observed the Sabbath by not working on Sunday. One such individual was heard to exclaim, on seeing two strangers fishing on Sunday, "My goodness, see those men fishing on Sunday! They must be unruly fellows!" He meant dangerously defiant of social custom. The intense disapproval of Sabbath-breaking was due, then, to the fact that abstinence from work on Sunday was the important social evidence of an inclination to keep God's law and to observe law and custom generally. Furthermore, there survived the superstition that God might punish the whole community for the sin of one, for instance, by a drought, and the minister did not hesitate to intensify this fear by a sermon on Achan.

Because of this intense feeling about working on Sunday, few men were inclined to brave the wrath of the community by doing it. Occasionally there was one. Often he was a man who was "bad" in other ways, and who seemed to care little what the community thought about him. Such a man was thoroughly detested. He was more abhorred because of his Sabbath-breaking than for any other aspect of his badness, even if it included beating his wife. He was the "hellion" of the neighbourhood. When a father reproved a boy whom he found breaking the Sabbath by making something or playing some game, he called him by the name of the man the community so thoroughly hated. In many parts of the state this feeling against working on Sunday and playing games like baseball continued unchanged until after 1900. Then there came a great change. Men who had denounced those who worked or played games on Sunday became less

severe. Working and playing on Sunday increased. Boys began to play baseball on a regular Sunday schedule. The minister merely remonstrated kindly with the individual instead of denouncing the sin from the pulpit as formerly. The change seems to have been due a good deal to the auto. Before the time of the auto, going on a picnic on Sunday was denounced. Then picnics became common. Then farmers who did not have autos went to work in their fields and, if remonstrated with, declared, "I don't think it is any worse to work on Sunday than to go tearing all over creation in an auto."

Works of necessity always were done on Sunday. Each community had certain recognized work of this kind. Everywhere "the chores," that is, feeding and caring for the animals, were done on Sunday. In the second period, in the fruit section, if a spell of warm, bright weather suddenly ripened the peaches, it was not only permissible but a duty to pick them on Sunday. "Isn't it better for God to get the money than to let the crop rot?" was the answer given the grain farmer back on the upland who questioned this custom of the fruit section. Because grain does not ripen so suddenly it was generally maintained in the grain section that a farmer should so plan the cutting of his grain as not to have any down on Sunday and liable to be spoiled by the weather. Old residents tell of a preacher who had a parish in a grain section and another in the neighbouring fruit section, and preached in the morning in the grain section from the text, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," and in the afternoon in the fruit section from the text, "The Sabbath was made for men and not man for the Sabbath." "For once he had to prepare two different sermons."

This fearful observance of the Sabbath implied a conception of God handed down with the culture of preceding ages but fostered by the conditions of this age. Let us examine these conditions. Nature was seen to have processes of invariable sequence, as the diurnal change from light to darkness and the succession of the seasons, but these sequences involved vital uncertainties as to the weather. An unusually early or late frost, an unusually wet or dry season might mean a loss of valuable crops. Now the weather was regarded as subject to the regulation of special providence. There was an "over-ruling providence"; God might influence the weather according to His mood. Now dependence on the mood of another was by no means contrary to social experience. As pointed out in a preceding chapter, the parent exacted obedience to commands not on the basis of their reasonable-

ness but "because I say so." And a parent's say-so depended a good deal on his mood. The child regarded the mood of the father with apprehension. When he got up in the morning he wondered whether father "would be grouty to-day" and kept out of the way until his parent's humour became apparent. This attitude of the child to an arbitrary parent predisposed to a belief in a God who acted according to his mood. Fearful or unfavourable natural conditions such as storms, drought were felt to be, possibly, manifestations of God's anger. Now the weekly abstinence from work and attendance at church was the ceremony whereby the people regularly took the precaution of making their peace with God and so insuring a mood in which the seasons would be ordered in mercy.

The attitude of children to parents was not, in all cases, an attitude to an arbitrary parent. To many the theology of an arbitrary God sounded rather strange. But the belief was impressed on children even by the most reasonable parents. It was a relic of an autocratic ecclesiastical system, but was tempered a good deal by the family attitudes of the time. Children who had an unusual affection for their parents but who, as children, accepted the customary religious beliefs sometimes found, on the death of their parents, that these beliefs had a new meaning. The attitude which they had had toward the parents, now that the parents were gone was transmuted to the religious sphere and gave the individual a more vital conception of a spiritual parent. Loss of a parent was considered by the minister to be a time favourable for the conversion of children. No sentence of the evangelist was more weighty than "Beware of thinking lightly of your father's and your mother's God."

Thus family, as well as economic attitudes were powerful incentives to religion. The intervention of divine providence was sought on behalf of loved ones as well as for economic ends. And it was particularly in connection with loved ones that the central aspect of religion came to the fore. Religion had to do with the future state, with the life after death and the reunion with loved ones. Heaven was a place where broken families would be reunited. This belief more than any other thrilled the believer. The hard experiences of life were merely "God trying me and making me worthy of heaven." This side of religion appealed particularly to the farmer's wife but it moved the men also. However much the hardheaded farmer might make religion a practical matter for this life, it had to do also with the future life. This was kept before the farmer by the minister

and his solitary life conduced to dwelling on it more or less. This conception of a future life was a point of departure for a series of ideas which were subjectively determined and which were prompted by attitudes other than the economic, which had to do with the objective, material world. "You cannot take anything with you" was the laconic way in which this contrast of religion with the economic life was expressed. However, though religion was a means of satisfying people about the future life, particularly by giving assurance of a reunited family, and though the man for whom the unseen was a means of real spiritual development might be loved and his spiritual life made a matter of neighbourhood comment, it was the prosperous farmer, whose religion was ostensibly a practical matter of church attendance and respectable living, who had the influence in the church.

Belief in special providence was the central belief of the practical farmer. It was generally believed that God gave prosperity and the fact that a man was prosperous was taken by him as signifying that he had the favour of God. When a period of good prices made many farmers prosperous there was a general feeling that the Lord was with them. If it was objected that the unrighteous were prosperous as well as the righteous the farmer quoted, with an attitude of resignation, a verse of Scripture: "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." If the argument went further the farmer would declare that "The devil will come in for his own." That is, the prosperous man who served the devil would find that he was not ahead any for the devil would come in for his own. Such a man might be prosperous but he would not be happy. There was one thing that the farmer valued above prosperity and that was a happy family life. And because the prosperous man who was irreligious was apt to find it difficult to control his children, without the sanction that religion gave self-denial, it really did seem oftentimes that the devil did pursue the prosperous man and spoil his family happiness.

Among the attitudes connected with the belief in special providence is that of resignation. If the godly farmer prayed for some good turn of fortune and did not get it, he might later find that it was better for him that he did not get it, so his faith in prayer was confirmed by not having it answered. God knew best. And if it was not evident why it was best that the prayer had not been answered, still God could make any misfortune redound to man's spiritual growth. The minister preached that, just as it was not always best for the child

to give it what it wanted, so it was not always best for man that God should give him what he wanted; but God could use a misfortune in this life to make man more fit for happiness in the next. So the belief in special providence was maintained though providence might apparently fail to act. Farmers do not seem to have been generally subject to agitation because of loss or disappointment. Religion resigned the God-fearing farmer to the disappointments of life. To-day resignation frequently is expressed in a non-religious form, for instance, "If we had prosperity all the time, we wouldn't appreciate it as much as we do." The non-religious expression of resignation often is a concession to an increasing social tendency to disbelief, while the farmer himself in his heart is as religious as ever.

Among the farmers of the early period there were various non-religious forms of resignation. "Whatever is to be will be" is a formula that was prevalent in the early days and survives to-day. As to resignation to the death of a friend or relative, the formula next in importance to the religious formula, "It is God's will," was an economic one, "His work is done." Work meant not work in the narrower sense but the life work. When the father and mother had raised a family of children and had seen them started in life they began to feel that their work was done. The person who was to die was reconciled by the thought that his or her work was done. Conversely a middle-aged person who was seriously ill was strengthened in the belief that he or she would not die because his or her work was not yet done, and this faith and determination not to die increased the chances of recovery. If he or she did die, then it was said that God's ways are unaccountable to man. For some reason it was for the best, if we only knew it.

The belief in special providence involved a willingness to do whatever would win the favour of providence. Hence the supreme interest in Sabbath observance. It was believed that the Lord would prosper the Sabbath keeper. The minister warned against the Sabbath breaker. He preached that not only would he suffer in the next life but also he would be sorry in this life and the prevailing belief was that an unbeliever "will get his pay in this life." Sooner or later some sickness or misfortune is apt to come to every family, so the Sabbath breaker would, sooner or later, stand discredited. Illness of himself or his family, loss by fire, disease among his animals were solemnly pointed to by the neighbours as punishment for Sabbath breaking. The Sabbath breaker left unpunished was never mentioned

or it was maintained that "he isn't dead yet." The sickness or misfortune of the Sabbath keeper passed without comment. The sceptically inclined were more or less influenced by this attitude of the community. They secretly feared that what the community was thinking might come true. If the farmer was not afraid, his wife was. So men who had no religion were inclined to keep the Sabbath. Sometimes a man "had to have a lesson" before he was brought to his knees. In one community the story was told of how a man who habitually worked on Sunday lost a cow. Still he continued to work on Sunday. Then the lightning struck his barn. He stopped working on Sunday. An instance like this of a recalcitrant farmer brought to his knees had a pronounced effect on the imagination of the countryside.

Sabbath observance by abstinence from unnecessary work on the whole contributed to economic efficiency because, for a part of the year at least the population was overworked and rest one day in seven was a welcome let-down. In the course of the centuries there has developed a weekly work-relaxation rhythm with which rhythmic biological and mental processes have become associated. The fixity of a religious practice which satisfies an essential psychological process is assumed to be accounted for by the religious justifications of it, but the fact that these do not account for it is evident when the justifications become discredited and the practice stays on. To-day farmers no longer generally believe that Sabbath breaking will be punished by some misfortune befalling the guilty one, yet, for the most part, they do not work regularly on that day as they do on week days. Originally it was a rest for the farmer to remain indoors and let religious contemplation absorb his mind and take it off his work. To-day the auto enables him to go whither he will.

The practical farmer inherited a theological system essential in which was the belief in a God of wrath against sinners. It was believed that God would punish sinners in this life and that there was an eternal punishment for all sinners in the next. The minister was not backward in asserting all this and the people believed it. At the same time among the people the tendency was not to talk much about hell, more about heaven, and not to ascribe the misfortune suffered by the sinner in this life to an angry God so much as to the natural result of serving the devil. However, believers professed the traditional theology *in toto*. The series of beliefs involved were the sin of Adam, the anger of God, the condemnation of all men to eternal

punishment for the sin of one, the salvation of men from this fate through believing that the sacrifice of Christ satisfied God's anger, loving Him for His sacrifice and showing this by joining the church. This theological system gave an incentive to soul saving, that is, to presenting these doctrines to unbelievers in a way to arouse them to a sense of their lost condition and incite them to come out and join the church. The church annually launched a soul saving movement called a revival. This usually assumed the form of a series of meetings held each evening for some weeks during the winter, and in which two or more churches of the community usually united under the leadership of a professional evangelist.

Revivals were held throughout the rural parts of New York up to the close of the last century and, in some parts, after that time. There were stirring revivals throughout the state in the years 1801, 1816, 1819, 1836, 1838, 1847, 1866, 1877, 1879. In addition to these great revivals, the churches of the community held "special meetings" almost every winter. The methods employed were everywhere much the same. The evangelist had to contend with the lukewarmness of the "formal Christians" as well as with the sinners. One of his favourite methods was to begin with an attack on the lukewarm and the "erring brethren." In doing this he cleverly took advantage of the attitude to church members of those he ultimately aimed to reach, that is, the sinners. Their attitude was represented in the oft-repeated sneer, "I'd rather not be a church member than to be one like" So-and-So. The evangelist began by attacking So-and-So. He had learned that So-and-So was addicted to hard cider. So, from the pulpit on the first night he declared: "There are those among you who profane the name of God by your empty profession. I am talking about the man who professes total abstinence and then in secret likes his hard cider." The few sinners present heard this and told the others how the evangelist "gave it" to So-and-So who was known to like his hard cider. More sinners came the next night to hear other brethren "get it." Finally, when the evangelist had got all the sinners there he turned on them. Some of them were put under conviction the first night. Others were "mad, so mad that they could not stay away." Each night the excitement increased. The evangelist told the sinners that it was because he loved them that he warned them and denounced their ways. The sinners retaliated, on one occasion, by firing off a cannon in front of the church and surrounding the church in an angry crowd to mob the preacher.

But the preacher stood his ground, declaring "I'd rather make you mad than not; when you get mad there's some hope for you." And, sure enough, "some of the maddest were finally converted and praised the Lord the loudest." As to the brethren who had been attacked and also were angry, when they saw the sinners under conviction they forgot their own humiliation. However, an evangelist often left bitter animosities in the community. While the more philosophical were reconciled by the reflection that "We all got it," some were not blessed with this comforting sense of the general wickedness.

The impulse for salvation from eternal punishment was what gave the impetus to revivals. As soon as the evangelist got sinners thoroughly aroused to the certainty of eternal punishment, they were in a mood to accept his suggestions as to the way of salvation. In making eternal punishment essential Protestants were at one with Catholics. As one Catholic farmer put it, to prove that the different sects were not as far apart as appeared on the surface, "I guess we all are trying to keep out of hell." This emphasis on eternal punishment was due to the reiteration of evangelists and priests in their intent on making good their social control. The professing Christian dwelt on heaven rather than on hell. If a person really believed in eternal torment for those of his friends who were unsaved, of course he would be constantly urging on them their lost condition, but this was never done except in a period of revival excitement. Even then it was more natural to speak to unsaved relatives and neighbours of the goodness of God and of the happy future that might be theirs than of eternal punishment.

The sectarian feeling between Protestants and Catholics was due not so much to the different beliefs of the two sects as to the attitudes of authority and subordination that characterized the Catholic church and the alleged servile attitude of Catholics to the priest, as compared with the democratic attitude of Protestant churches and the independent attitude of members to the minister. The attitude of the American farmer was one of independence and resistance of an assumption of authority by ecclesiastics so that he disliked the traditional attitude of the Catholic Church. The aversion was primarily towards the church rather than towards individual members. The Catholic farmer was thought of as "just ignorant enough" to let the priest keep him in subjection. But here is a strange inconsistency. Along with this hostile reaction to the autocratic Catholic attitude there was a tendency to excuse and justify it. After criticizing Catholics,

Protestants sometimes hastened to say: "After all we could not do without the Catholic Church. You've got to keep the masses down." [3] Protestants regarded this as the function of Protestant religion as well. "The religion of that early day was emotional rather than spiritual, and hell-fire was preached more than Christian living; but in spite of dogmatic narrowness, the Christian atmosphere helped much to hold that vigorous, fun-loving, intemperate, pioneer people within reasonable bounds." [4] It was generally believed that the natural impulses of man are bad, that inhibition of them is necessary not only for personal success but also for social order. The idea was that without constant emphasis on self-restraint young people would be uncontrollable and families would get nothing ahead and would be "on the town" in bad times. As the immigration of Irishmen and other foreigners of the Catholic faith increased there was an increasing sense of the importance of the church. The priest was expected to control his parishioners and was criticized when he failed to restrain conspicuous self-indulgence, for instance, when Catholics would stop at the tavern for a drink on the way home from church.

Not only between Catholics and Protestants but also between different Protestant sects there was pronounced sectarian feeling. This was due to the difference between sects in their attitude to pleasure. Between Protestant sects that were alike austere in their attitude to pleasure, as the Congregationalists, Baptists and Methodists, there was little sectarian feeling, as compared with that between sects that were austere and those that would not proscribe dancing and card-playing, for instance, the Episcopalians. Difference in essential beliefs also played a part in sectarianism. The feeling against Unitarians was as strong as that against Catholics because Unitarians denied the divinity of Christ as interpreted by the evangelical sects. This feeling against Unitarians diminished in the second and third periods as the importance of beliefs diminished but that against Catholics did not. For the Catholic Church continued autocratic in principle and therefore contrary to the democratic attitude of American rural life.

Another factor in sectarianism was the rivalry of sects for members and for the attention of the community. This affected every sect in its relation to the others. It caused churches to improve the attractive features of the church edifice and furnishings and of the church services. It also caused sects to emphasize their distinctive beliefs. Strength of belief often seemed to issue more from a feeling of

defiance of other sects than from any religious value of the belief itself. Distinctive rites and forms of church government seem to have been emphasized from this motive.

Another reason for sectarian feeling was that it was in harmony with the prevailing emphasis on loyalty. This was a deep-seated rural attitude. The feeling was that a man must be loyal to his family, his community, his political party, his church. The result was that, while there was ordinarily no pronounced feeling between sects which emphasized the same underlying tendencies of social relationship, the same attitude toward pleasure and the same essential beliefs, still each church member was out-and-out for his own church and would not attend the church of another sect if one of his own was accessible. A church member who was drawn from a service in his own church by an attraction in another was contemned as lacking in loyalty. Now this loyalty was vitally connected with the loyalty of children to parents. Parents felt that it was incumbent on their children, as an expression of filial loyalty, to accept the church of their parents. Nothing more hurt a parent than to have a son or daughter join another church, unless after marriage, when the wife, if a member of another church, joined the church of her husband.

We have said that sects differed in their attitude to pleasure. The sects that were strongest in the rural districts were austere in their attitude to pleasure. These sects disapproved of billiard, pool and card playing, dancing and theatre-going. The church did not formally disapprove of liquor drinking until about 1840. In fact up to that time it was thought uncivil to fail to offer the minister a glass of ale or wine when he made a pastoral call. The younger generation, however, were more inclined than the older to drink to excess. The saloons of the rural neighbourhoods became dens of drunkenness and by 1840 total abstinence had become a watchword of most Protestant sects. The reaction against excessive liquor drinking was not confined to the churches. In 1844 the Washingtonian temperance movement spread through New York. Lecturers pictured the lost condition of the drinker and choruses of young men sang temperance songs. Great excitement prevailed and a large number signed the pledge to total abstinence. For some years the temperance question continued uppermost and everybody took sides. Many towns voted "no licence" and others polled the largest "no licence" vote in the history of the town. However, the feeling against the liquor traffic was soon

on the wane, and the resolutions against liquor drinking adopted by the churches became dead letters, though it continued to be frowned on, particularly by the Baptist and Methodist sects.

The minister's favourite line was against self-indulgence and worldliness in general. He built on two principles. The first was that the only way to avoid excessive indulgence is to abstain from all indulgence. You never can be sure of your control in moderate indulgence. Moderate liquor drinking was, therefore, declared to be as reprehensible as drunkenness. By the same logic indulgence in all the proscribed forms of pleasure was held to be equally sinful. As he said, "A man who has a billiard table in his house is as bad as a saloon-keeper." The second principle was, "You are your brother's keeper." It was admitted that some men might be strong enough to indulge in forbidden pleasures without suffering great moral harm. Nevertheless to do so was sinful for, although you may be strong enough to withstand temptation, you may, by indulging, make your brother to offend. "For your influence on the lives of others God will hold you accountable in the day of judgment." To this doctrine the pleasure-loving individual retorted that he did not believe he was his brother's keeper; he regarded himself as free to live his own life and to indulge himself as he liked. He calculated he was able to stop short of excessive indulgence but if he did not it was his own affair. This conflict between the self-denying and the self-indulging people was the main feature of the religious life of the early days. A man must be saved from his lower nature, from his impulses to self-indulgence. That was the doctrine of the church.

Consistency was a much extolled virtue. It meant observing every feature of Christian behaviour. The minister was not only the leader in worship but the exemplar of righteousness. He must be consistent in everything. He was, like the farmer, primarily a man of action, not of thought. His business was to declare dogma and the Christian standards of conduct and to practise what he preached. The preferred type of minister was the "straightforward man," erect in bearing, unequivocal in thought, frank even to bluntness in expression, consistent in thought and action. There must be no compromise with worldliness. The minister must believe not only in temperance but in total abstinence and "come out fair and square for it." One must be a total abstainer or he was as bad as a drunkard. One must believe every single religious doctrine or he was an infidel. One was bound for heaven or for hell.

The minister was expected to exemplify in his words and manner the spirit of unworldliness. His black apparel, dignified mien and "set" facial expression evidenced self-restraint. He not only preached against the proscribed amusements but occasionally denounced from the pulpit commercial enterprises, as full of temptations to dishonesty. In the early decades more than one minister was dismissed by the church for owning stock in a commercial enterprise. Thus in personal appearance, conduct and preaching the minister exemplified unworldliness.

The minister's unworldliness was a public concern because on it depended his efficiency. His intercessions for the beneficent intervention of providence would not be successful unless his behaviour was "well pleasing" to God. Divine aid was sought not only in connection with the weather but also in those exigencies in which human help was of no avail, as in cases of sickness which baffled the physician's skill. On the minister's blamelessness before God depended his power to serve his people in these vital exigencies.

As one who stood thus near to God, the minister was regarded with awe. A call from him was a solemn occasion. He was jealously required to visit all families of the church impartially, for his visits had an important social significance: the fact that the minister called upon and prayed with a family showed that family to be respectable and living in the way approved by the community. The minister was expected not to visit a family that was not living up to the moral requirements of the community, not to eat and drink with the ungodly. Doing this would cast suspicion of worldliness on him and it would evidence a social approval of families of which the community did not approve.

The self-restraint or unworldliness of institutional religion is to be distinguished from the self-restraint of personal religion. The latter involved a sense of personal allegiance to Christ, the cultivation of an attitude of "Thy will be done," a crucifixion of self that the Christian might know only the will of God. But unworldliness for the rank and file of church people meant, not the self-restraint of personal allegiance, but self-denial for its own sake, that is, because that represented what was to the people of that day exemplary character. It was exemplary because it conduced to efficiency in work and accumulation. Self-indulgence would interfere with steady work. Anything that had a tendency to weaken man for the struggle with nature was proscribed.

When in the second period self-denial was no longer as strict an economic necessity as at first, the more austere ministers who continued to preach self-denial found their influence decreasing. The tendency was to be less straightforward in the preaching of morality, One line of moral conduct after another, once sanctioned by religion, was relegated to the sphere of the "secular" and, as such, was "outside the sphere of religion." The tendency was to confine preaching more and more to strictly theological matter, or to take some social topic that was running in the papers and magazines at the time. The minister, instead of emphasizing his unworldliness, came more and more to display his knowledge of the world. Especially in the villages, during the second period, the successful minister was the handsome, well dressed, sociable man who had travelled extensively, read widely and could be entertaining at all times, in sermons as well as in social functions. It was the sagacious minister, who avoided "bones of contention," that came to be more and more sought after. To be sure, he himself must not play cards and dance; but it would not do to come out too strongly against these amusements for others.

The rural religion was an adaptive culture in the sense that it contributed to economic and social efficiency. Sabbath keeping strengthened the people because of the needed rest and because the church services idealized the attitudes involved in efficient living under the prevailing conditions. Religion involved no imagination. It was a functioning of attitudes. Hence the firmness of religious faith. The old residents with whom I discussed religion admitted that it made people more efficient workers—of course it did—that is, provided they did not get carried away by strange doctrines. But to say that its truth lay in its contribution to efficiency, that it was true merely as a way of thinking and doing that strengthened one for the battle of life and not because the beliefs really were true, that was another matter. The doctrines were really true, of course they were. God was a being, a person, just as distinct and personal as any other person. He created the earth as described in the Bible and ordained the Sabbath. One could not doubt any part of the Bible without casting suspicion on it all. The farmer accepted the Bible as literally inspired and left it to the minister to explain away whatever inconsistencies between various parts of the Bible this belief involved.

This strict orthodoxy was strengthened by the farmer's isolation, which fostered a strong preference for the familiar, including the familiar doctrines, formulas and ceremonies. His isolation also made

his mental processes largely retrospective so that he dwelt upon the past. In this reminiscence he dwelt especially on ideas that he liked, and other ideas were adhered to because of their connection with these. The idea of loved ones whom he would see again suggested a place and this place a deity who made the place. So retrospection intensified orthodoxy. Fear in its various forms had the same effect—fear of the social disapproval of heterodoxy, fear as to the uncertain future. The farmer felt that he was on the safe side if he accepted religious doctrines as laid down—on the safe side for this life and the next. Pride also strengthened orthodoxy. There were certain beliefs that the farmer seemed to hold because of the satisfaction this gave his pride. The Baptist doctrine of close communion often seemed to be held with a feeling that, if surrendered, the other sects would say the Baptists were giving up. This pride and defiance of other sects was especially marked in connection with the less essential doctrines that distinguish different sects. Orthodoxy was due also to the constructive tendency. For an hour or more on Sunday the minister expounded a logical sermon, a structure of ideas, and farmers capable of constructiveness in ideas enjoyed the sermon. To satisfy the constructive tendency all ideas that were necessary to a consistent discourse must be accepted. So the orthodox attitude included an emphasis on consistency. Aside from these more fundamental tendencies a variety of other attitudes contributed to orthodoxy. As the child accepted every injunction of the parent as such, so the Bible was accepted as literally inspired from cover to cover. If a person doubted any part of the Bible as conventionally interpreted, he doubted it all. With the passing of isolation and of family and neighbourhood centredness, social attitudes so changed as to weaken orthodoxy.

The generally accepted theology was a system of the supernatural that explained all the problems of the universe satisfactorily; so there was no need of looking for other explanation. The creation of the world, the origin of plants and of all species of animals and of man, the course of human history, the end of the world, the future life, all were explained by the minister. To the boy who happened to get interested in geology or astronomy the parent said, "Why bother your brains about it?"—implying that everything that required any explanation was satisfactorily explained in the Bible. The emphasis was on attention to the day's work and a child who was given to having his nose in a book was a sore trial. For a person of such tastes there was no leisure and no privacy in the house. There was

no sympathy for him, either, if he came to believe anything about creation, or the course of history, or the future life that was contrary to sound doctrine. Religious doubt was regarded as not only a perilous state but also as disloyal to the parental teaching and disloyal to God. At the same time there were farmers who would read a sceptical book, possibly out of curiosity or because of the fascination of forbidden fruit, but avowedly to strengthen their belief, that is, as a sort of tilt with the devil, to test their power to maintain their faith in the face of the devil's strongest arguments. More than one farmer kept Tom Paine's *Age of Reason* in the house, locked up of course from the other members of the family. And children thus came to regard certain works as "awful" books which they must never look into.

The lack of knowledge and the tendency to accept the ready theological explanations of everything that might otherwise arouse a dangerous curiosity predisposed the population to the acceptance of plausible justifications of any custom or belief that happened to be doubted. Children and youths who had not yet acquired the theological habit were naturally curious. They were either squelched with, "Oh, stop asking questions!" or the questioning tendency was suppressed in a manner more gratifying to the parent, that is, by giving plausible "reasons." These secondary explanations required some little exercise of the imagination, a faculty otherwise suppressed by the overweening emphasis on action and conventionality.

Reasoning by analogy was one of the conspicuous processes of these secondary explanations. Reasoning by analogy is prominent in theological explanations, in which it is carried on endlessly. The church member who was interested in natural science never tired of showing the analogy between the story of the creation in the book of Genesis and the account as given by the scientist. So the Bible gained great prestige as supported by science and as antedating scientific discoveries, and the local scientist won prestige as a learned defender of dogma.

Most rural communities had their sceptics, whose occasional arguments with the orthodox were occasions of general interest and were talked about throughout the neighbourhood. The argument usually began with the creation and seldom got further. The sceptic maintained, on the analogy of the builder, that it could not be assumed that the universe was made as a builder makes a house because, if it were, the creator would have had to have stood outside of it and there is no outside. His opponent would not admit that there is no outside—to

be sure there may be an outside—nobody can know for nobody has ever come to the end of the inside. But granted there is no outside, the creator did not necessarily have to be on the outside. The processes of growth are from the inside. Take the crops in the spring, what makes them grow? But the sceptic was a lawyer and this mysticism of the farmer did not appeal to him. "What makes them grow? Natural law, of course. Nothing else."

"It does, hey! Well, if law makes things grow, we'll have to call on you lawyers the next dry spell."

If ever they got beyond the creation to the future life, there again reasoning was by analogy. The lawyer challenged his opponent to show how there could be "a place big enough to hold all the spirits."

More common than justification of beliefs by reasoning by analogy were justifications by quoting Scripture. The minister's method was to take a text and then lead back to it again and again as authority for all the ideas of his sermon. The more fertile he was in applying his text the more he was admired. "I never knew a man who could get so much out of a text" was the way the admiration was sometimes expressed. He quoted Scripture liberally throughout the sermon and the people were thereby accustomed to a far-fetched use of the Bible in support of any idea or way of believing they wanted to impress on others. For instance, a farmer liked to go off with his gun when he had a leisure hour but his wife did not approve of his shooting birds, not even blackbirds. He persisted. "But," remarked the daughter, "when mother quoted Scripture to him he couldn't say a thing." She was more learned and clever in the use of Scripture than he but there were a few texts that served his interests and he used them without mercy when she resisted.

Interest in doctrines and Scripture diminished after the first period and so there was less inclination to argue about doctrines and to quote Scripture. There was also less interest in the preaching and the other purely religious aspects of church services; the services came to have more aesthetic interest. For this reason churches which emphasized ceremonial gained on those that did not, and the latter tended to increase somewhat the ceremonial part of their services. What Thomas and Znaniecki say of the Polish peasant is true of the American farmer, particularly of the women: "Religious beliefs whose seriousness is lost or whose real sense is forgotten become aesthetic attitudes. Often while the religious attitude is still vital it is so mixed with aesthetic feeling that it is impossible to determine

which is more important. Many religious songs are sung at home for the sake of aesthetic enjoyment. . . ." [5] Aesthetic feeling always has been somewhat associated with religious worship. "Dressing up" to go to church always has been the custom. Church people came to allow amusements on Sunday in which the aesthetic as contrasted with the active and noisy aspect predominated, as walking through the fields and woods or driving. This aesthetic aspect of religion became prominent in the church services during the second period and resulted in the expenditure of a good deal of money on church furnishings and music. Many members were frank to say they had ceased to have interest in doctrines but found in the service a good deal of aesthetic satisfaction. However, many of those who had ceased to believe the traditional system of theology continued to believe in, and to cultivate an intimate fellowship with a personal Saviour. This personal religion was found in the rural districts from the first and to it the next chapter is devoted.

CHAPTER XVI

ATTITUDES OF PERSONAL RELIGION

INSTITUTIONAL religion tended to shape the religious experience of all after one pattern. But there were individuals whose religion was distinctly a personal experience. In some churches one man or one woman stood head and shoulders above the rest as a "real Christian" and was so recognized not only by the other church members but also by the community at large. Some churches had several of these real Christians. Their daily walk and conversation were "of the spirit," that is, expressed a love, forbearance, courage, patience, self-sacrifice that seemed so unusual as to be explained only by an unusual contact with the unseen. It was such a one who was called to visit the sick and distressed and to console the dying.

Personal religion was the religion of people of an unusually sensitive and sympathetic disposition. The religion of some sects, as the Quakers, seemed to produce on unusual number of people of this Christian disposition. In all sects doubtless a much larger number of people had some experience of personal religion than was realized. The experience was not apt to be talked about. The unusually sensitive and sympathetic people got their stimulus to personal religion from impulses which the everyday life did little to satisfy. The hard life of the farmer was quite devoid of the finer satisfactions and the unusual man or woman must find them, if at all, in religious contemplation. Among the rank and file the stimulus to personal religion came from the consciousness of unruly impulses that must be curbed. Most people were in some degree conscious of this need of religion. For they had strong impulses and, therefore, were apt to go to an extreme in satisfactions. While the normal condition of the well adjusted personality is one of moderate and balanced satisfactions, the prevailing condition of a hard-working rural population seems to be one of more or less unbalanced, impulsive behaviour with a tendency to go to extremes in satisfactions. Such a population has much work to do and often overworks, is very hungry and often overeats, is

eager for wealth and often is over-ambitious, is pugnacious and often gets into disputes with neighbours. Under the influence of this strenuous life children were impulsive and with difficulty were restrained by prohibitions laid down by their elders. Children were told that they must be responsible in behaviour, that they must act according to conscience. This trust in conscience implied that it was through conscience that one got divine guidance in the vexing problems of life.

Consciences differed. There was the conscience which knew only the prevailing moral standards, and there was the conscience of the unusually sensitive person. The latter was more conscious of impulsiveness than the insensitive person, who was annoyed only when his impulses got him into trouble. So the sensitive person went back to the teachings of Christ and tried to square his life by those teachings. This personal religion was a means of producing balance. Sin was any extreme or unwise impulse and the religious attitude was a looking to a present Saviour for presence of mind to control impulse. So the emphasis was on humility—"Not my will but thine be done." This attitude put the individual into the proper attitude to his impulsive self—what matters it anyway, what I want is really trivial compared with the joy of this spiritual relation with the unseen. Thus religion was a force that made for balance and tranquillity in the personal life and for considerateness and love of others. It smoothed out the distortions due to impulsiveness, and made it possible for impulses suppressed thereby to function normally.

To be sure personal religion was sometimes used to sanction an undue suppression of normal impulses as well as to control extreme ones. Among agricultural populations the world over, the women particularly have suffered from suppression and have been more religious than men. In our rural population the mother who felt that her sacrifices for the family were not appreciated found comfort and quiet joy in the thought that "God knows." And her solicitude that the children should be saved was not merely that they might be saved from the punishment of the unsaved but that they might through their lives find the unfailing comfort and peace that she enjoyed. A mother could not say much on this aspect of religion to her children because they had not yet had the hard experiences that make men and women yearn for it. But she wanted them to become acquainted with God, that they might find Him when they needed Him. The saintly wife often went far beyond what was good for the other

members of the family in her sacrifices for them. But circumstances often required suppression on the part of all. The attitude of self-restraint was pronounced and the hardships of life were such that even the strongest felt at times the need of "the everlasting arms."

While personal religion did function for the suppression of normal impulses, this should not blind us to its function of aiding in the control of extreme impulses. The appetite for drink, extreme and unwholesome physical appetites of all kinds, hot-temper, greed in money-making and other extreme impulses were sometimes brought under control by personal religion. The change was initiated by religious conversion and the saved person continued to "grow in grace." A man thus successful in controlling his extreme impulses through religion was called "an overcomer." This was the word most frequently used to designate a successful Christian.

Personal religion was not entirely distinct from institutional. That minister had greatest power with his people who was most subtle in discerning their "trials," that is, the impulses and fears they were trying to control, and whose sermons suggested the ideas that served these spiritual needs. Furthermore, it was in the atmosphere of church worship that the individual found inspiration to prevail over his or her lower self. Particularly was there inspiration in the prayers of an understanding minister. The minister who was "powerful in prayer" was the one who was himself an "overcomer" and was desperately in earnest and utterly unselfish on behalf of the spiritual uplift of his people. In so far as the church had leaders of this kind, institutional served the ends of personal religion.

CHAPTER XVII

ATTITUDES OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

CHILDREN were educated mainly in the home. More of the necessary preparation for life was derived from association with the father and mother than to-day and less from the schools. Most boys followed the vocation of the father and got their education by working with him. The girls expected to become wives of farmers and the mothers trained them to become good housekeepers. Among the reasons why a vocation tended to pass from parents to children was that a son accepted his father's vocation as he did his political affiliation, as a matter of course. The son was closely associated with his father from a little boy, so he was disposed to follow his father's vocation and politics. Then, too, the education necessary in order to follow some other vocation was more difficult to get than to-day. Religious education, also, was given in the family. The reading of children was censored by the parents with a view to preventing their reading anything that would discredit religious doctrine. Publishers took advantage of this and published books and periodicals that would appeal to parents as "Christian." An old resident of our typical town said of her childhood: "My father was very careful to provide good reading for us. We took the *Christian Repository of Knowledge,* which contained much interesting and profitable information on all subjects."

The common school system had, before 1850, extended throughout the state. The school education was merely supplementary to that given in the home. Its purpose was limited to that of giving children such instruction in the rudiments as they needed to supplement their vocational training, also such training in character as incidentally resulted from school discipline. There were religious exercises in the school but religious instruction was avoided because of the jealousy between the different sects. It was difficult to make instruction by a sectarian schoolmaster seem non-sectarian. The schoolmaster must be a member of a church, or at least a regular at-

tendant at church. He must, above all, conform to the attitudes and beliefs of the community. He boarded round and thus was thought of as in a sense belonging to the household of each family.[1]

Education emphasized discipline above everything else. There are several reasons for this emphasis. First, in addition to the economic motive for enforcing obedience already described there was the parent's natural impulse to force his or her ways of thinking on the child. This impulse is independent of the economic motive. It is found where children are no longer made to work but are indulged and brought up in luxury. It is due to the mental setness of parents. Harmonious association requires a degree of likeness of attitudes and beliefs, wherefore parents expect children to accept their own. Parents did not then, any more than now, seek to understand the child. They became impatient before the eternal "Why?" even when asked out of mere curiosity, and especially when asked in reply to an injunction to do something. The attitude of the parent to the child was to make the child "mind" and work hard, and the schoolmaster was enjoined to continue this discipline. Any teaching of the school that weakened the child's inclination to accept a parental belief or way of doing was resented, so that teachers conformed to the attitudes and beliefs of the neighbourhood instead of attempting an intellectual training. Children must be moulded after the pattern of the neighbourhood attitudes and beliefs.

A second reason for the emphasis on discipline in public education was the pugnacity of children, due to their active life from their earliest years and to the large families, which gave plenty of stimulus to quarreling. When they were thrown together in the school, the tendency to quarrel and fight received further stimulus. Many of the boys were older than those who attend school to-day and this encouraged resistance of the teacher. Hence the emphasis on discipline. Said one old resident: "The best teacher was the teacher who could keep the best order." Boys and girls must be taught to restrain their unruly impulses before they could become persistent workers and custom-observing citizens. The trustee enjoined the schoolmaster to "keep order whatever you do, and give 'em what knowledge you have time for after that's done. Cuff 'em, thrash 'em—any way to keep order; but, whatever you do, don't let 'em thrash you."

This rigorous parental and schoolmaster attitude was endorsed by the theological attitude of those days with its doctrine of original sin and the natural depravity of human nature. Children were naturally

perverse and must be saved from their lower impulses by family and school discipline.

The imparting of information was a secondary but important function of education. As we have seen the purpose of education was to give the child the rudiments which it could not acquire at home. Also, as will be shown in Chapter XVIII, the farmer emphasized the need of training the habit of remembering because so much of the knowledge a man required in his practical activities was derived from the spoken word of another and not from books. Capacity to remember was emphasized also because of the tendency to display knowledge and a good memory. Furthermore, much of what the people were interested in, for instance, the history of the neighbourhood, was oral tradition. An old lady who was well versed in this history stood high in the estimation of the neighbourhood. After listening to her narratives the neighbours would say, "What a wonderful memory she has!" Another reason for the emphasis on memory was that the submissive memorizing of imposed tasks fitted in with the disciplining attitude. Though the matter studied had little interest in itself, uninteresting studies were justified on the basis of their disciplinary value. It was said that irksome tasks strengthen the will; that boys and girls were to be made responsible men and women who could hold themselves to hard and uninteresting tasks by having others hold them to such tasks as children. The strengthening of concentration by associating interesting ideas with the task was little thought of, except as parents held that a child might occasionally be stimulated by promise of a reward. But rewards were sparingly used. They were not in harmony with the attitude of compelling the child to do the task. So education centred on compelling the child submissively to memorize uninteresting information. The result of the uninteresting character of rural education was to make compulsion an essential factor in education. "Children have to be made to learn," said the schoolmaster. Those who could be driven by inspiring fear studied in order to avoid punishment. Those who could be stimulated by appealing to their pride learned the lessons for the sake of winning high marks and badges. Those not susceptible of such stimulation invited punishment.

The emphasis on discipline meant that essential among the social attitudes cultivated by education was self-restraint. On this the schoolmaster was particularly intent. Where he failed utterly was in arousing intellectual interest. There was occasionally a bright boy

who was his special pride. He became the inspiration of such a boy, who was determined to "get off the farm," and who found the encouragement and advice of the schoolmaster invaluable. But the rank and file of pupils gave him little satisfaction. They balked at self-restraint and their repressed impulses found expression in forbidden pranks and the rod played a prominent part in education. One schoolmaster reserved all the "lickings" of the week until "public day," on Friday afternoon. Then after the speaking of pieces came the "lickings."

In spite of this disciplinary aspect of public education, there was a good deal that was pleasant about it. Though the schoolmaster did not believe in self-expression, the children did, as the pranks during school hours and the games and fights at recess proved. The school room was well filled with children as compared with the quiet few found there to-day. The school was the neighbourhood centre in which were held the spelling matches and debates and the singing schools for old as well as young. A live teacher encouraged debates and spelling matches between schools of different neighbourhoods.

The early attitudes of public education continue to the present day. The tasks still are uninteresting though the means of stimulating pupils to learn have changed somewhat. The rod is less used and rewards are more in evidence. The rod is most effective with the timid child, while rewards appeal to the few who have some chance of winning the honours. That is, the ones most stimulated are those whom it is least necessary to stimulate; or they are the timid children who are afraid to appear indifferent. This is one explanation of the fact that the best pupils according to the artificial scholastic standards often do not make the most successful men and women. Fear does not make a successful man or woman, though it may incite a boy or girl to study. Nor does a merely good memory and a capacity to excel in passing examinations guarantee success. One sometimes hears men declare that the boys who were best in their school have not been very successful men. Allowing for their rather crude conception of success, their contention often seems borne out by the facts; and the explanation seems to be in their crude conception of best pupil. He was best only according to the standards of an artificial system of education.

The rural population is ceasing to be satisfied with this traditional system of education. The intelligent farmer says to his boy, "I didn't have an opportunity for an education and I want to give you

one." The boy goes to the district school with the idea that it is the first step in his education. So he is less inclined to "cut up" in school than formerly. Furthermore, the farmer's sense of independence is less pronounced to-day than in the early days and this affects his children. The family feels it is a part of a larger world to which education is an avenue of approach. Along with this new attitude of the intelligent farmer, there is a new attitude on the part of the teacher. Teachers are better trained than formerly and seek to co-operate with intelligent families for the development of their children. So we have, on the one hand, a new co-operative attitude which is beginning to pervade some schools, and, on the other, the traditional attitudes of discipline and defiance or submissiveness.

CHAPTER XVIII

INTELLECTUAL ATTITUDES

AN understanding of the intellectual attitudes of the farmer requires that we visualize his economic situation. For most of his waking hours were spent in work. First, we must appreciate the fact that possession of a farm not only made him independent but also obliged him to use initiative. The farmer must decide day by day what he was to accomplish and then put through the day's work. This situation developed two pronounced intellectual attitudes. First, it threw him on his own resources and compelled him to rely on his own wit and ingenuity when obstacles had to be overcome or something had to be made or mended. This developed what we call an inductive intellectual attitude, that is, a habit of noticing the relevant facts in the situation and drawing conclusions from those facts. He formulated inductively his idea of what was to be done. Then he did it. Second, because he worked so much alone or with his boys or hired men with whom he would not expect to discuss anything, he had the habit of acting on his own ideas, without discussion with others. To be sure the farmer's boys early developed a very active tendency to point out relevant facts and suggest what ought to be done in a situation. The farmer would often listen good-naturedly to a boy of seven. But this discussion with his boys did not extend to the larger problems of the farm—problems as to what acreage should be planted with this or that crop, when it should be planted, cultivated and the harvest begun. His solitary life strengthened the tendency to act on his own ideas. This developed a deductive intellectual attitude. This attitude prompted him to accept without question beliefs that had passed down from father to son, and thinking consisted of finding ideas to support the beliefs rather than in frank investigation to prove or disprove them.

Let us consider first the inductive and then the deductive attitude. The inductive attitude was in evidence constantly. Farmers had to make investigations at every turn. The farmer had to go out and examine the condition of the ground to see when it was just ready

to plow, when it was just ready to drag, when it was ready to plant, when the crops were ready for this operation and that operation, when the grain was just ready to harvest. He had to watch his animals and feed and care for them in a way to keep them in good form. He had to study the symptoms of a sick animal and doctor it. Of course watching the ground and the crops consisted a good deal in deductively applying certain tests he had acquired from his father. But situations arose that required induction, as in the case of sick animals or of an unusual situation as a shortage of seed or a break-down of the wagon or machine. As an instance of a shortage of seed, when potatoes were scarce and a farmer had not enough for seed and the table he had his wife peel potatoes with thick peelings and then he planted the peelings. This was a pure experiment. Again, when a machine broke down, the farmer had to mend it then and there. The work could not go on until it was mended. Under this stress of necessity even a dull boy showed an astonishing attention to the details of a machine, their relation and functions, and remarkable ingenuity in mending it. The boy with an unusual bent for experimentation had a good deal of opportunity to develop it on the farm. Possibly the remarkable development of the industrial arts in the United States in the nineteenth century was a good deal due to this rural attitude of practical ingenuity. Certain it is that very many of the improvements in crops and animals were made by plant and animal breeders who were farmers or were born and reared on the farm.[1]

For most farmers, however, their mental alertness was narrowly circumscribed by the practical end in view. So it was with another important mental tendency, constructiveness. Induction does not get one very far unless supplemented by constructive imagination. Among the rural population there was little imagination because the constructive tendency always served an extremely practical purpose. It was incidental to getting the day's work done. The important manifestation of the constructive tendency was the farmer's organization of the economic activities of his family. He planned the day's work, adjusted the part each man, woman and child should do to that of the others, and instructed each in the use of animals and tools in order to accomplish most with least effort. The action of the constructive tendency resembled domination somewhat because, in organizing and directing, the farmer's intense interest in his project sometimes made him appear domineering. So the farmer of pronounced constructive capacity wanted tractable workmen. Above all he preferred working with men

who understood him and valued his superior organizing power and made allowances for the peremptory tone of some of his directions. He "did not mean it" and wanted his directions to be taken in the real spirit in which they were given, that is, in the spirit of construction instead of domination.

The farmer showed little interest in ideas that did not have a practical significance. He had little scientific curiosity. He soon wearied of a discussion that involved ideas he could not easily follow. Also he resented the thought of another's knowing more than he did. Consequently farmers never got very far in understanding their economic relations with the outside world, or in the discussion of political issues. This lack of reflection was the weak point in the farmer's intelligence. As soon as he got away from the obviously practical then the tendency was to reason deductively from phrases and beliefs that had been handed down from generation to generation.

But let us understand the reasons for his narrow intellectual horizon. First, we must think of a man who had twice as many things to do in a day as he could do well. He used his head to save his heels. He planned to make every move count in as many ways as possible. Thinking was a means to a maximum of doing. One who has not been in such a situation cannot realize how deadly such a habit of mind becomes to all reflection. The necessity of doing precludes all thought as to the reasonableness of the doing. The farmer had a farm on his hands; he had accepted the farmer's life; a good deal of the time his work drove him; when he had been put behind by an unfavourable season he felt "driven to death." Under these conditions thought merely serves as a tool to save the weary body. Second, the farmer's isolation, while it gave an opportunity for reflection, gave him little to think about but his own ideas. It is this intellectual attitude that caused rules and proverbs to persist so long in the rural districts. Whenever a question came up as to the authority of a rule or proverb, even an intelligent farmer who no longer followed it would think that "There might be *some* truth in it." And he would proceed to explain how this might be. That is, his tendency was to give it a degree of justification, though he no longer followed it. The tendency was to try to reconcile the new with the old, in order to justify the old. Hence the persistence, with some change, of old religious, political and other beliefs which new knowledge and new conditions discredited.

The isolation of the farmer strengthened the tendency to prefer the

familiar to the unfamiliar, and this accentuated his preference for familiar ways of thinking. Farmers who had a decided preference for the unfamiliar migrated west or to the cities and left the home-loving type on the farm. They loved the familiar faces, the old homestead, the old church. To be sure the farmer was curious about a stranger who drove along the road and wondered who he was and where he was going. He was hospitable, too, if a stranger needed shelter. At the same time he had a suspicion of strangers, a certain reaction against them just because they were strangers, unless a stranger could prove relationship with familiar people. This preference for the familiar affected his intellectual processes. He had a predilection for the familiar formulas and ways of doing. The minister stressed this attitude for the familiar and thereby strengthened the tendency to conform to biblical texts as the familiar rule of faith and practice.

A third condition that circumscribed the farmer's intellectual horizon was the uncertainty of the weather. Because of this there was a sense of the futility of scientific knowledge so far as agriculture was concerned, an inclination not to plan much for the future, a feeling that man's efforts were of small account as compared with the overwhelming importance of conditions beyond his control. So there was a reliance on signs and formulas and a disposition not to "bother your head" about your affairs but to be content with mere industrious working in the conventional way. This attitude was accentuated by the independence of the farmer and his satisfaction with a mere living, also by the confining nature of his occupation, which gave him no time to drop his work long enough to avail himself of opportunities for getting new ideas.

The opportunities for getting new ideas were few enough even under the most favourable conditions. The farmer got his knowledge of farming as a boy from his father in the course of the daily work. He learned unconsciously in the course of doing. It was not apt to occur to him that there could be better ways of doing. So he got into the habit of thinking that his father's ways could not be improved. Political and religious beliefs were accepted in the same unconscious way. His attitude to contrary beliefs and ways of doing was more or less contemptuous. If he had doubts as to his own, pride would not let him acknowledge that they might not be entirely correct.

Because of his isolation the farmer did not come into contact with city populations and had an aversion for city people. Young people had begun to emigrate from the rural districts to the cities in the first

period but this had not yet become widespread enough to interest the farmers generally in relatives and friends in the cities. Farmers thought of city people as a distinct class. The working classes of cities were thought of as immeasurably lower than the farmers. The farmer contemptuously called the behaviour of the working masses in cities impulsive and ascribed most human ills to impulse. By impulsive he meant contrary to the tried ways of thinking and doing. This attitude has survived to the present day and the farmer thinks that impulse and subservience to demagogues, as he calls them, and susceptibility to crowd emotions characterize the masses of working people in cities. He feels that there is an essential difference between his psychology and theirs and is not much inclined, therefore, to act with them politically, though reason might tell him that his interests and theirs require much the same governmental policies.

New ideas may be acquired from informed people and from reading. The early farmer met few informed people. Reading for recreation was regarded as a useless occupation, except the reading of religious books. In most families one would find no books except a few song books or a biography or a volume of poems or of humour that had been purchased of some persistent book agent. The farmer respected a well-read man, particularly if he was also a successful business man, but he himself was primarily a man of action; the tendency was to think lightly of a man who used inherited wealth merely to indulge bookish tastes. Farmers did not feel companionable with a well-informed man. They were uneasy in his presence and quick to suspect that his learning gave him a sense of superiority. Where there was none of this feeling still they did not know how to take him. Each was uncongenial to the other. If a person's mind is preoccupied with work or if, for some other reason, he is not in the attitude of receiving information, the tendency is to shun those who dispense it and the shunning tends to take the form of dislike, sometimes of ridicule, when the informed man is the subject of conversation. This attitude has survived in the rural population.

New ideas may be acquired also, in the course of work and in recreation. How much did recreation serve this purpose? There were farmers who, in their leisure hours, were interested in new facts. They liked to have the cousin from the next county visit them and tell of the farming there. They liked particularly to hear about the great nation in which they lived. If a member of the community took a long journey, everybody wanted to call and see him on his return

and hear him tell about it. But, in their social gatherings there was little that was informing or instructive. Farmers liked to propound riddles and tell stories. The belief in ghosts survived because it furnished a background for strange tales. So recreation did little toward imparting any useful information. One reason was that farmers had little intellectual interest in the economic side of life. They sowed, cultivated and reaped in the customary way. Their ways were the same but varied in minor points and the farmer's pride prompted him to believe his way was best and to argue to that effect whenever the subject arose. So, when they met in a social way, farmers avoided these topics on which they would get serious, because they did not want to "raise an argument." But, in spite of this attitude, arguments were frequent enough. However, the social hour was more pleasant when conversation took another turn. It was not uncommon to thresh over some event in the history of the neighbourhood, for instance, whether Hall Green, now dead these many years, was the first man to live on the Hall Green place or whether someone else first lived there and built that house. Even this was apt to lead to argument which might wax warm; but it was an insignificant point which challenged nobody's standing as a farmer, as would methods of raising potatoes. It was much better to leave those live questions alone and to settle some historical question of the dim past, which, however, was never settled.

As to the other occasion of receiving new ideas—in connection with work—when information had to be acquired to serve a practical purpose the farmer could get it. The type of mind that the farm fostered and contributed to business and the professions was not the bright, quick, eager mind but the dogged mind that, when it finds something that must be mastered, masters it and "gets it for good." The farmer's practical attitude stimulated his memory. He read not for the pleasure of reading but to remember what he read because he wanted to use the knowledge. Much of what he learned he acquired from other farmers and this learning was, of course, time lost unless he remembered what he heard.

This habit of making it a point to remember he carried into occasions when he did not learn for immediate use. So he remembered a good deal of a lecture or a discourse he happened to hear. This habit of remembering was drilled into children. A child home from school who did not remember or had not learned something that the farmer thought he or she ought to know was severely condemned. Though

the farmer condemned impractical knowledge, yet in seasons when they were not driven by their work, many farmers showed an interest in ideas that were not in themselves practical but were connected with their practical activities. They were interested in information about their animals, their poultry, their bees, about the history of their grains and vegetables. If a farmer failed to find in a book the particular information he wanted he had no further interest in the book. He was not apt to care for a background of thought that would give him an insight into his problems but rather for information that served his practical interest at the moment, or satisfied his curiosity about familiar things. This lack of interest in the broader aspects of their problems tended to make farmers men of poor judgment.

The farmer's lack of judgment was seen when he developed an interest in a certain new crop or a new variety of vegetables or a new breed of horses or cattle and went into this line of agriculture without due consideration of the market possibilities. What he was interested in was the particular stallion from which he was to breed horses or the particular variety of potatoes from which he was to raise the valuable seed potatoes. The more fascinated he was by the particular animal or vegetable the more slender the data on market possibilities that were necessary to induce him to make the venture. Of course the habitual caution of the farmer, the impulse to keep what he had already saved, operated to prevent rash ventures. This also impeded judgment. The tendency was either to be rash in a venture or, at the other extreme, over-cautious. The latter was more common.

The farmer's lack of judgment was evident, also, in his tendency to emotional judgments in his relations with other people. For instance, suppose a storekeeper lowered his price on a certain article owing to another store selling it at a lower price. The farmer was exasperated to think that the storekeeper whom he had thought was selling as low as possible, could afford to lower his price when competition compelled him to. He was angry at the storekeeper for having got more money out of him than he ought to all these years. Also, because he thought himself clever in business dealings, he was a little crestfallen to think that the storekeeper had got the best of him. So he denounced him in unmeasured terms. This was in the forenoon, in town. Then as he jogged home he thought it all over. He remembered a time when this storekeeper did him a good turn—took his eggs when he already had more eggs than he could sell and

allowed him the regular price. He did not have to take his eggs back home. So by the time he got home he was thinking that the storekeeper had after all been fair with him. Now this tendency to snap judgments about people seems to have been due to his lack of experience with people, owing to which one impression produced its effect before the effect was modified by association with recollections. If he was a man of some capacity for reflection and had had enough experiences of this change of mind, he recalled these experiences, and this recollection influenced him to suspend judgment. But, unfortunately, the tendency to unfair, unforgiving judgment of others was widespread. Particularly was this true of judgments of foreigners of a nationality or a sect that was disliked and the result was a tendency to fanaticism.

The farmer lacked the power of reflection required for good judgment. His main interest was in getting things done. This made him narrow-minded and averse to considering another's point of view. In directing the work of the family his attitude was, "I won't argue the point. Go ahead and do as I direct." Outside the family his attitude was to accord every man a right to a similar position of authority in his own family and to a similar liberty to have his own opinions in his relations with neighbours. The result was a general averseness to giving serious consideration to another's point of view.

The assertiveness of farmers took the form, among others, of pride in their own opinions. This expressed itself in two pronounced attitudes, an averseness to admitting that one was mistaken and a tendency to argue. As to the first, admitting that one was mistaken was an admission of inferiority in judgment, hence the averseness to it. The man who did admit a mistake was thought to be very unusual and was highly regarded. Nevertheless the prevailing attitude was to the contrary. The farmer's pride in his own judgment sometimes cost him something. For instance, a farmer invested some money in worthless stock. A friend pointed out that it was worthless and volunteered to write the owner of the factory upbraiding him for selling the stock to his friend and demanding that he pay back the money and take the stock. To his surprise the factory owner reluctantly consented to do so. To his greater surprise the farmer balked at the transaction. His pride would not let him admit that his judgment had been at fault. He had from the first opposed his friend's efforts on his behalf. He kept his stock and never got any dividends; thus he paid for the satisfaction of his pride.

The tendency to argue was due to the intellectual satisfaction involved, among a people who had few opportunities for mental exercise, and also to the prevailing averseness to admitting that one was mistaken. The farmer would not argue with his children. But he would lean on his hoe and tell his neighbour how he planted and cultivated this crop or that, with the attitude of one who did not expect his ideas to be questioned; and, if questioned, an argument was apt to result. The farmer would go to any length to make it appear that he was right. He declared his opinion with emotional intensity and regarded his personal honour as involved in maintaining it. He might acknowledge the contrary opinion to be right but held his own to be right also. He would listen good-naturedly to an opponent and then would use every available idea of his opponent's argument to support his own. In his acceptance of the premises of argument he was led not by an earnest intent on their truth but by their plausibility or by his appreciation of the author of them, or by their antiquity or general acceptance.

A tendency to argue was characteristic not only of farmers but also of men in other occupations. The files of rural papers of the early days contain controversial letters, columns long, on political and religious questions, which abound in rhetorical flourishes, figures of speech and extreme statements suggested by the antagonistic attitude of the writer. The clergyman as well as the editor was argumentative. In his discourse he reasoned deductively, associated with his doctrine all possible prestige ideas, and made the opposing ideas seem contemptible by contemptible associations. Sometimes he did not hesitate to call sponsors of opposing ideas contemptible names. The keenness of his reasoning came from the impulse to close every avenue of escape from the ideas he was trying to impress. This cocksureness, this aggressiveness made the sermon interesting to the farmer who was himself more or less that kind of a man; he accepted the premises of the preacher and so moved along with his thought with a right good will, as the latter dominated the imaginary unbeliever. Dogmas were the clergyman's premises of reasoning and any question of the day gained an added interest as soon as it was seen to have some relation to dogma, for instance, the slavery question as soon as the argument took the form of attempting to prove whether slavery was scriptural or unscriptural.[2] As the farmer had fixed ways of doing, as premises for argument as to the superiority of his ways, so the clergyman had fixed ways of thinking—dogmas—as premises for argument as to the truth

of his ways. So the manner of life of the farmer supported the minister's way of thinking and the minister's way of thinking supported the farmer's adherence to custom. In addition to other reasons for the farmer's interest in religion there was, at least in the more intellectual type of farmer, this enjoyment of the argumentative discourse of the clergyman.

This prevalence of deductive thinking and argument was, in the last analysis, a result of the farmer's economic situation as an isolated worker. He was accustomed to doing things according to rule. Planting, cultivating, harvesting, the care of animals, all were done according to rule. The thinking of the farmer generally was by means of formulas. For instance, he frequently used the formula, "One man's gain is another man's loss," to explain economic relations. He saw that the buyer, when buying his produce gained by buying at a low price and the farmer lost; the farmer gained by selling at a high price and the buyer lost. In hiring a man the farmer gained by paying a low wage and the man lost; when the man could demand a high wage, the farmer lost. This relation of one-man's-gain-another-man's-loss he projected into that mesh of economic relations which he did not understand, those of the merchant, the manufacturer, the banker and concluded that whenever one man gained another lost, and that business men generally profited a good deal at the expense of the farmer. Another formula that was much used was "Whatever is to be will be." This functioned much like the formula "It is God's will" and was used by farmers who were not very religious when resignation was required and by all farmers for bad luck in situations in which God could not be supposed to be interested. It was used with reference to any bad luck whatever—when the farmer broke his leg, when a valued horse died. By the resignation suggested by the formula he escaped worrying over the inevitable. By it also he escaped the necessity of inquiring into the real causes of what had happened, whereby he might have acquired knowledge that would have been of use in the future.

The farmer acquired a variety of rules and formulas in the course of his vocational education. In the community wise sayings passed from mouth to mouth. A farmer, in conversation, would quote what some highly respected man of the past had said, with the remark, "I never forgot that." The rules, formulas and wise sayings were uncritically accepted and had much the same meaning generation after generation. This set of beliefs gave the farmer's character a posi-

tiveness of which he was conscious, on which he prided himself, and which caused him to laugh at a man who was inclined to be uncertain as to what he thought about this or that.

Reliance on formulas is characteristic of an active people and is adaptive as long as the conditions which produced the formulas do not change. On the other hand changing conditions may be obscured by a formula for it is, after all, a substitute for a critical attitude to a situation. It is a convenient means of escape from problems. Now use of formulas is a mental habit that is common among agricultural peoples the world over. It is everywhere the cornerstone of the conservative mind. It seems probable that one reason for the prevalence of this process in the thinking of the American people to-day is the fact that, until recently, so large a proportion of our population were rural. This rural attitude passed into American life generally and it was strengthened because it characterized also the thinking of two professional groups of great prestige, lawyers and clergymen.

The farmer's power of action and his closely knit body of beliefs made him a man of conviction. He was not content with merely believing something. The tendency was to act according to belief. He both acquired this trait from the culture of the time and developed mental habits that would accentuate it. Thus it was that, if he had any intellectual power at all, he trained himself to clear thinking. For clearness in thinking strengthens conviction. He formulated his ideas with a view to making them clear and convincing, and thus conducive to action. His economic position favoured fidelity to conviction. He did not have to consider that his ideas might be disapproved of by a landlord or might reach the ear of an employer. A man who "didn't dare say what he thought" was put in the same category with the man who did not keep his word. The increasing dependence of modern life and its suggestibility to the opinions of men of prestige and to the press is weakening this independence in thought and strength of conviction.

This strength of conviction in the young man of unusual capacity who went from the farm into the law or the ministry showed itself in the "power of conviction" that characterized the leaders of those times. When Abraham Lincoln declared at the flag-raising ceremony at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, that "I have said nothing but what I am willing to live by, and, if it be the will of Almighty God, to die by," he expressed an attitude that gave men confidence in him. The impulse of leaders was for that careful thinking that gave them

a telling strength of conviction and that enabled them to clarify the minds of others and so convince others of the truth of their opinions.

The attitude for frankness in thought and expression caused a hearty contempt for individuals who were timid about expressing their beliefs and an aversion for organizations that maintained secrecy as to their principles and practices. The anti-masonic craze, which started with the disappearance and supposed murder of Morgan, who undertook to publish the secrets of the Masonic order, swept the state. Farmers declared that "it was a shame that, in a free country, a man should be prevented from saying what he pleased." Many churches passed resolutions excluding Masons from membership and Masonic lodges were forced to suspend their meetings for a time.

While there was a strong sentiment for saying what one thought and permitting others to do the same, one was not supposed to think what was contrary to essential religious, political or economic beliefs. If one had atheistic or anarchistic or socialistic opinions he was expected to keep them to himself. Even outspoken abolitionists were long frowned on. The minister who delivered an abolition sermon in which he was vehement in his arguments against those who maintained that the Bible supported slavery was apt to stir ill-feeling. The attitude of those who opposed slavery was that it is wrong for one person to own another. But what's the use of talking about it; leave it alone and it will die out. Thus the attitude for freedom of thought and frankness in expression appeared more pronounced than it really was. Where men do not differ radically, because nobody questions the premises that all accept, there appears to be a good degree of free speech and tolerance. On the other hand, in these latter years when premises begin to be questioned and men begin to differ fundamentally, there may appear to be less freedom of speech generally and a stronger tendency to intolerance, simply because of the intolerant attitude of the shallow-minded toward many people who are really thinking more freely and thoroughly.

The farmer's physical and mental isolation fostered an attitude of reserve. He was not inclined to discuss his opinions with others. His reserve caused him to keep to himself much more than men generally do. It was a common saying that "There are two things a farmer never tells—how much money he has and which way he voted." Most men keep these matters to themselves. The farmer was close-mouthed generally and this habit of reticence often was a cause of extreme annoyance to his family when they were eager to know which

way his mind was tending in matters that were vital for their happiness. His reticence was due not only to the reserve that inevitably resulted from his isolation but also to the indecision due to his dependence on the uncertain weather and seasons. Because of his reticence the farmer distrusted a man who was inclined to talk about his private affairs. Such a man seemed to him to be lacking in sincerity, for he could not conceive of a man's honestly disclosing his affairs. He thought of him as telling what would make a favourable impression and withholding what would not. As contrasted with this the farmer was reserved, sincere and direct in what he did say.

The farmer's reserve shut off from his ideas the vitalizing effect of free and frank discussion. His habit was to mull over his ideas by himself in a way to justify his opinions until those that had any emotional trend at all became obsessions. For this reason his aversions tended to be deep-seated. Hence the intense partisanship and sectarianism of many farmers, their fanatical dislike of certain foreigners, their distrust of city people, of the working masses in cities and of the financial interests that centred there. The farmer was credulous along the lines of his prejudices and the clergyman or politician who understood these could move him mightily.

This tendency to emotional opinions affected family relations rather unfortunately. Farmers of a certain temperament were apt to "get a grouch" in the family. When in this condition the farmer was apt to refuse to say what was the matter, when asked by his wife. This unreasonable attitude in turn developed ill-feeling in the wife, which proved to the husband that his grouch was justified. This tendency of the farmer was made an occasion of humour in the saying that the farmer had this advantage over the city man, that the latter had no place to go when he got a grouch while the farmer could always go out to the barn. Of course the situation is just the opposite. The city man can more easily find distractions to relieve his state of mind than can the farmer. The farmer of a certain temperament also was liable to obsessions of dislike toward neighbours. He was quick to imagine that a neighbour was taking advantage, and he was apt to "hold a grudge" against a neighbour. He was prone to think he had been wronged and to exaggerate the wrong done him. This was one reason for the tendency toward litigation to be described later.[4]

The narrow interest in ideas and the tendency to become obsessed with particular ideas was characteristic of men in other occupations than farming. It was characteristic, as we have seen, of the preacher

and also of the newspaper editor. For instance, the files of the local paper of our typical town for 1825-35 contain no news, local or foreign. The columns are filled with long dissertations on theological subjects and with editorials on "perpetual motion," the hobby of the editor. The active farmer, also, was interested in perpetual motion but not from the theoretical point of view. He was a good deal bored by the ideas of the editor and regretted that the paper did not give a little information about some event in which people were particularly interested, for instance, whether the cholera in a neighbouring city was abating. On the whole, however, social conditions were such that there was not the eagerness for news that later developed. The people of a community "knew all about each other so that they didn't need any paper to tell them." Furthermore, it was more difficult to gather news from other communities than in these days of good mail service, the telephone, the auto, and good roads. As soon as improvements in communication increased travelling and acquaintanceship, the desire for news increased and this began to be satisfied as soon as enterprising editors found it out.

One other characteristic of the farmer's thinking remains to be mentioned. In his adherence to beliefs he was moved more or less by his feelings. This was particularly true of religious beliefs. They were held as true because they gave "soul satisfaction." The farmer needed encouragement and hopefulness in hard and discouraging situations. Religion was the supreme means whereby the farmer was made hopeful that a bad season would take a turn for the better or was made resigned to the inevitable. Not only economic situations but family troubles and bereavement begot a need of hopefulness. He enjoyed listening to sermons that gave him satisfaction in these situations. He was easily satisfied because he wanted to be. The ideas were held to be true because they were satisfying. Because the inductive attitude was almost wholly confined to practical matters, these satisfying associations of religious ideas were not subjected to criticism. The entire supernatural system was self-consistent as long as its essential ideas were supremely satisfying. Their satisfyingness caused them to be held as true regardless of anything to the contrary, and from them as essential principles, the minister could, by logical reasoning, make almost any of his deductions seem plausible.

The active life and the intensely practical attitude of the farmer afforded little opportunity for aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment. All around him were the beauties of nature but he was too strenuous

to appreciate them. At least he was not conscious of this appreciation, but it was more prominent in his subconscious life than he was aware of. One indication of this is the retrospective consciousness of young men born and brought up on the farm who later went to live in the city. There the beauties of the country seemed more alluring than when they were among them and they went back to them whenever the opportunity came. Another attitude of the farmer of which the individual becomes clearly conscious by being deprived of opportunity for its satisfaction is independence. The farm-bred boy who moved to the city complained that there one must dress and act just so, as compared with the freedom of the country. But in the country there is comparatively little consciousness of this freedom.

The farmer's aesthetic appreciation was limited. In the rural districts as elsewhere there developed an aesthetic pose, particularly among the women. The farmer received good-naturedly the news that his daughter was progressing in her "new fangled music" or painting, but what he enjoyed was an old song well sung or a good sketch of a familiar scene. He also enjoyed "natural beauty," as he called it. A sleek, finely formed animal, a red-cheeked girl, a beautifully grained piece of wood caught his eye. A spreading tree in the yard was his special pride. He would go a long way to see an exquisitely shaped racing horse. Most pleasing of all was the sight of his growing crops. After the hard years of clearing the land came the years of real production. The farmer enjoyed preparing a piece of virgin soil for the crop. Its dark, rich colour thrilled him. He enjoyed the sight of the long straight rows of green, the sound of the rustling corn, the feel of the hard ears as he gathered them. In the cultivation of his crop he cultivated in order that the field might "look nice" as well as for the sake of getting a good yield.

The farmer's intellectual attitudes on the whole adapted him to his environment. Adaptation called for a minimum of reflection. Consequently, when closer relations with the business world and the increasing effect of governmental policies on his prosperity resulted in a need of greater power of reflection, his fixed beliefs and reliance on formulas, his tendency to argue for his beliefs and formulas, even his power of conviction were less adaptive than formerly. But these intellectual attitudes persisted in spite of the new conditions, and this accounts for the backwardness of rural organization.

CHAPTER XIX

JURISTIC ATTITUDES

DEMOCRACY meant to the early farmer at least three things, personal liberty, social equality, and respect for law. The belief in personal liberty was strengthened by the farmer's independent ownership of land and by his enterprise in the cultivation of it. It was strengthened also by recollections of Old World tyranny. In the Old World those in whom individual initiative was highly developed were thereby brought into conflict with the ruling class which would repress the initiative of the rising middle class. Hence the resistance of this ruling class by those who finally left the Old World and settled in the colonies. This attitude of resistance was voiced as the right of personal liberty and this assumed a variety of juristic aspects, as the right of the people to take up land, their right to determine what taxes they should pay, their right of free speech, their right to go into politics and aspire to any office, to profess any religion. These rights were quite generally given legal recognition.

Social equality meant that all were subject to the common lot of daily work, though some might be more successful in accumulating wealth than others. The idea was that accident of birth should not make a man superior to his fellows. His superiority should rest in his personal superiority as a worker. However the farmer stood for an unrestricted right of bequest and inheritance. He distrusted extreme economic inequality as subversive both of liberty and of social equality and, at the same time, stood for rights that made economic and social inequality inevitable.

The third element in the conception of democracy we shall consider at some length. The juristic attitude of respect for law was an outstanding attitude in the early neighbourhood and it has remained fundamental in rural psychology to this day. It was maintained as an essential principle of democracy and as absolutely necessary if personal liberty was to be maintained in a society of equals and an orderly freedom secured to all. The farmer understood that democ-

racy was an experiment. He realized that "men are looking out for themselves first and last and all the time" and that human wilfulness has to be curbed. He had to curb it in his children and in himself. The farmer's active, aggressive life made wilfulness pronounced. It caused much dissension in the community and the church. So he realized that if democracy was to endure there must be some restraint on human wilfulness. The law could be expected to exert this restraint only if there was a general respect for law such that the individual law-breaker would be summarily dealt with. Whenever the officers of the law were unable to cope with law-breakers, as with a gang of horse-thieves at bay in a swamp, the farmers proceeded to the spot and administered summary justice.

The belief that law should be respected and enforced was due to the economic conditions that resulted in a high degree of economic equality and in an aggressive and self-willed pursuit of wealth. These conditions, as explained in Chapter XI, fostered also an attitude of rigorous self-restraint and this attitude was the tap-root of the demand for rigorous enforcement of law. Self-restraint was the essential characteristic of the austere type of farmer and it was this type that especially emphasized law enforcement. The attitude for law enforcement was, therefore, in part, one of the many expressions of the disposition of self-restraint. This was strengthened by the economic conditions of the time. The child acquired self-restraint from being made constantly to restrain himself or herself, and also from the daily example of the self-restraint of the parents in the midst of work, hardships, failure, disappointment and bereavement. The attitude became fundamental in character. The boy held himself to his work, gritted his teeth when he failed or was disappointed, spurned opportunities for a moment's pleasure or ease, despised an easy-going and pleasure-loving neighbour, and felt a determined attitude against anybody who disregarded the law to satisfy his own pleasure. So the attitude for the rigorous enforcement of law was one expression of the disposition of self-restraint. One in whom this disposition was pronounced had an austere attitude toward those who lacked self-restraint, and wished them under the hand of the law.

As a result of this emphasis on law enforcement, there was an undue reliance on mere law as a means of social welfare. Other attitudes contributed to this. One of these was the intellectual attitude of regard for rules and formulas described in Chapter XVIII. Adher-

ence to rules and formulas was conspicuous in every phase of social organization. In rearing their children parents were guided by the rules and proverbs they had acquired from their elders. In his economic life the farmer relied on proverbs about the weather and on rules for doing things that had been handed down by his fathers. In his religious life he relied on the ritual, ceremonies and rules laid down by the church. It was this attitude that inclined the farmer to accept the sayings of Scripture about the proper relation of husband and wife, about divorce, about the proper relation of children to parents as rules that applied not only to the social conditions of those ancient times but also to all times and places. It was easy for the people thus dogmatically to apply Scripture because it was in harmony with their tendency to apply traditional rules generally in all their behaviour. Now this penchant for rules, which determined the domestic, economic and religious behaviour of the farmer, determined his political behaviour also, once the political relations of the new nation had become established. The farmer was inclined to quote the wise sayings of the revered leaders of his party, as if that settled the argument on any question. It determined also his juristic attitude. The farmer was inclined to rely on mere law. This attitude has passed into American life. Hence our first thought, in connection with a desired reform, is to get a law passed against the evil in mind and rely on the law. The farmer did not believe much in new laws. But he believed in enforcing the existing laws and in settling every difficulty by an appeal to law. As the father, in his predilection for the rules for rearing children handed from the past, did not consider the different personalities of his children in their upbringing, so the tendency was not to consider the social and economic conditions of those to whom a law was to be applied but to apply it rigidly in its traditional sense. Reliance on rules, proverbs, Scripture, wise sayings, law—that was the attitude of those days.

The rural attitude to law also had in it an element obviously not original in a society in which people make the laws and unmake them. This was a tendency to regard law as something unchangeable. This attitude of subservience to unchangeable law characterizes a state in which the laws are made for the people, not by them. But it was in line with some of the attitudes of the early rural population. One of these was the attitude developed in children by their parental training. Parents took care to "stick to" what they commanded, "for if I do not my children will not respect me." This attitude served to

prepare children to regard law as unchangeable. Also parents maintained that children should "mind" without expecting any explanation as to the reason for a command. "Because I say so" was said to be sufficient reason; on that ground, all parental injunctions were of a like importance to children. Just so the emphasis on respect for law as command had a tendency to make all laws of like importance. Law as such must be enforced. This attitude to law also was in line with religious attitudes. There was in the attitude to law an element of awe; the power behind it was thought of as inexorable and the law-breaker's fate as awful beyond anything though it might mean only jail for thirty days. This was due to the constant emphasis by the minister on law as the command of God and on the awfulness of God's law. This ecclesiastical influence emphasized, also, the unchangeableness of law—"I am the Lord, I change not" was the text on this occasion.

The prevailing adherence to custom tended to increase respect for law. In the second period changing behaviour in certain respects resulted in a weakening regard for certain customs, and this diminished regard for laws associated therewith. When customs thus discredited were fundamental there ensued a weakening of the general tendency to adhere to custom, and this weakened respect for law. This change became marked in the villages in the second and third periods but was less in evidence among the farmers.

Along with the early attitude of respect for law there was a keen regard for personal liberty and a deep-seated fear of giving the state too much power. This was due to the prevailing aversion to the autocratic power of European states. At the same time the power of the state was by no means despised. It was because it was not that there was an attitude against giving the state the right to curtail personal liberty except when it seemed absolutely necessary in order to restrain harmful wilfulness. The respect for the power of the state was an attitude inherited from the past and, as we saw in Chapter V, the weather attitudes of the farmer accentuated political subservience. This subservience to government was in proportion to the effect on the imagination of the consideration of its might. The state government was regarded as mighty but the federal government was felt to be an all-powerful, irresistible force to which, whether just or unjust, man must bow. As an instance of the attitude to state government, when, in constructing a road, the course of the road was so laid out as to injure a farmer's property, though he felt keenly the injustice he

was apt to submit without formal protest, though not without much complaining. "You can't do anything against the state." The attitude toward the federal government was still more abject. For instance, in case of some trifling interference with the mail the offence was discussed in awful whispers because it was an offence against the federal government and the punishment that might be expected terrified the mind. The government was not thought of as a body of officials created by the people but as some overwhelming authority against which, however arbitrary it might be, the individual had no redress. And, as a matter of fact, of course he had none.[1]

Law in the early neighbourhood had a twofold function: It embodied restraints on human wilfulness which the community would enforce, and it was the means whereby the self-reliant farmer got his rights in a dispute over property. It was to law in its restraining function—to the criminal law—that the attitude of respect for law as such was principally directed. There was a difference in the farmer's attitude to law in a criminal and in a civil case. In the former the law and the judge were objects of fearful regard. Extreme abhorrence was felt for a person found guilty and he felt the overwhelming disgrace. In the latter the law and the judge were less objects of fearful regard. The judicial decision might be questioned and the beaten party might vow to work against the judge next election. In the eyes of the community the beaten party was not to be abhorred; he merely got the worst of it.

The attitude to law affected the attitude to the judge. There was a strange admixture of awful regard for the judge as the exponent of criminal law and a matter-of-fact attitude to him as the means of getting justice done in a dispute over property. Because of the popular respect for the judge he had an excessive respect for himself. This was more true of a judge who was a lawyer than of one who was merely a farmer. The former was apt to assume the dominating, order-preserving attitude of an exponent of the criminal law rather than the common-sense attitude of an arbiter in disputes over property.

Let us look, first, at the rural attitude to the criminal law. Then we shall consider the attitude to the law as a means of getting justice in disputes over property. Crimes were acts which were felt to be a menace to the community, but the penalty imposed, in so far as this was left to the discretion of the court, depended more on the degree of resentment felt because of the act than on the degree of punish-

ment that was necessary to stop the offence. Furthermore, the degree of resentment against a person because of an offence did not indicate the degree in which the act was a social menace. A man convicted of "assault and battery" was less abhorred than one convicted of petty theft. The pronounced pugnacity of the population inevitably resulted in occasional assaults while stealing was not in line with the prevailing habits. A petty theft was the chief topic of conversation for months after it occurred. A thief brought back to the scene of his crime for trial was viewed aghast from doors and windows and his crime was discussed in awful whispers. A thief never shook off the stigma attached to his name and his family were apt to be so grief-stricken that, even if not shunned by the neighbours, as they usually were, they voluntarily withdrew largely from social intercourse, and when they chanced to meet their neighbours, "didn't dare look them in the face." Now this difference between the feeling against one guilty of assault and one guilty of theft does not indicate the relative seriousness of the two offences. A poor, harmless thief, whose crime could not have had any dangerous influence because of the general lack of inclination to steal, was intensely abhorred while a roustabout, instead of being arrested, was allowed to swagger and intimidate the youth of the neighbourhood until some day a farmer's son, down from the hills, "threw him down like a sack of potatoes." Quite often a man felt it to be dishonourable and a confession of weakness to go to law against one who had assaulted him. The honourable way was to thrash him. Even the minister was sometimes forced to resort to his fists in order to maintain his prestige in the community.[2]

The rare occurrence of theft in the American rural community is explained by the contrast with its frequency in the Russian rural community. In the latter, "The explanation of the prevalence of petty thieving seems to lie in the survival of ideas originating in bondage. Under bondage the peasant had no legal right to any property. It was, therefore, difficult for him to conceive of any such right on the part of anyone else. Moreover, the community of occupancy of land and the community of use of agricultural instruments—although not invariable or universal—bred in the peasant a certain indifference to property considered as an individual possession."[3] In Poland, also, stealing among peasants is associated with landlordism.[4] In the United States, on the other hand, individual ownership strengthened

respect for others' property rights. Few individual fortunes had then become so large as to cause the suspicion that they could not have been made honestly.

Because theft was rare it was the more abhorred as an unusual violation of customary behaviour. This motive in the abhorrence of the law-breaker must not be lost sight of. Very unusual breaches of custom, also, were abhorred. Some of these stirred as much abhorrence as violations of law. For instance, a wife who left her husband and little children was intensely abhorred and talked about for weeks. The abhorrence took no account of the circumstances in the case, which generally were little known. It was assumed that any woman who could leave little children, regardless of the difficulty of living with her husband, was little short of a monster. In addition to compassion for the children there was indignation because of this very unusual violation of certain highly esteemed attitudes, particularly that of loyalty of wife to husband.

Getting drunk was abhorred because of the emphasis in the rural community on efficient and virile manhood, and the drunken man was the negation of everything manly or even human. So far to forget one's manhood as to get drunk was felt to deserve the extremest contempt. The farmer expressed this sense of shame when he said, "I would rather see my boy dead than lying drunk beside the road." In the first generation liquor drinking in moderation was quite prevalent but drunkenness was rare. The settlers were not men of that kind. But, when the second generation was coming to maturity, excessive drinking increased alarmingly. This was due to the increase of saloons and to the fact that farmers now had more leisure in winter because the land had been cleared. The energetic farmer worked in the woods throughout the winter but there were many who were not industrious enough for this and life was monotonous without the customary activity. The monotony and the digestive disorders occasioned by heavy eating in idleness caused an appetite for liquor. Labourers in cities show the same tendency toward increased liquor drinking when out of work. In the rural districts drunkenness with its accompanying worries and indecencies increased, and the reaction came in the form of the Washingtonian total abstinence crusade of 1844. One of the results was legislation against public intoxication. The enforcement of the law depended, however, on how the public happened to feel about drunkenness at the time and on who was intoxicated.

We turn now to the second function of law. It was that whereby the self-reliant farmer got his rights in a dispute over property. In our typical town, as in other rural communities of the state, lawsuits "came off" in the town and the county courts. Interest in suits in the county court may be inferred from the remark of an old resident of our typical town: "So many went to court in the fall that there wa'n't enough left to do the chores." Of lawsuits held in the town courts it was said, "We had a lawsuit about every other day, and, before it was over, often the contending parties, the witnesses and the judge were pretty drunk." This frequency of lawsuits obtained throughout the state but the records are very fragmentary. In no rural town in which I have studied this subject are there complete records of the town courts throughout the entire history of the town. For instance, take the records of our typical town. There is not a complete record for any one year of the cases tried in town courts. For the years 1828–30 one of three dockets is extant, and two dockets for 1842–45. No criminal case is recorded in the docket of 1828–30 and only two criminal cases in those of 1842–45. Of civil cases the docket of 1828–30 records 289, those of 1842–45, 196. That is, one of the three earlier dockets records twice as many cases as two of the later ones, and this while the population of the town, in 1825, was only eighty-seven percent of what it was in 1845. It would appear, therefore, that, in our typical town, "lawing it" decreased between the two periods. This decrease seems to have continued after 1845, and, during the second period, lawsuits were very rare. Criminal cases, on the contrary, increased but these were largely cases of non-resident tramps arrested for drunkenness and vagrancy. This decrease in litigation can be traced in other parts of the state.

The disputes over property in the early days were carried into the ecclesiastical courts and caused a good deal of wrangling among church members over secular affairs. This resulted in factional feuds and, sometimes, in breaking up the church. This aspect of juristic activity can best be described by adverting to our typical town. The Baptist Church was no sooner instituted in 1801 than dissensions arose and conflicts became so bitter that in 1807 the church was broken up. In 1814 it was reorganized with the following manifesto: "The Baptist Church of Christ . . . having waded in . . . trials and difficulties, and their travel as a church having ceased, it pleased God to send Elder John Upfold amongst us. A conference was held. . . . The brethren present agreed to leave off all their old difficulties and travel

forward . . . without bringing any of their former troubles with them." The services of the church were resumed but in less than two months the brethren restarted the "trials and difficulties" by "stating things which the church had convenanted not to bring into the church when they took up their travel." Then follow amusing accounts of the trials of recreant members by the church setting as an ecclesiastical court. From 1801 to 1855, one hundred and one trials are recorded, in seventy-four of which the defendant was excluded from the church. The number of trials and exclusions probably was much greater than this as it is evident from the imperfect records that not all trials were recorded. Of the seventy-six cases in which the cause of action is recorded, the charge was, in four cases, fornication or adultery; in thirteen, dishonesty or swearing or intoxication or telling a falsehood or desertion of husband; in two, attending a turkey-shoot; in six, refusing to leave the Masonic Society during the anti-masonic crusade; while, in fifty-one, the charge was "not going to meeting," or "breach of the covenant," or "breach of the Sabbath." Several charges under the latter head sound childish. For instance, one man was accused of "strolling his fields and mending his fence" on Sunday and his apology was voted "not satisfactory." He offered four other apologies on successive occasions, each being voted not satisfactory, and finally he was excluded. Each successive apology split the church more and more into factions, some regarding it as sufficient, others as not so. Thus the quarreling went on until 1855, after which no trials are recorded. The largest number of trials in any one decade came in 1836–45. After that date trials became rare and people were excluded from membership only for such offences as drunkenness, immorality and "ceasing to walk with the church." The Congregational Church was torn with dissensions during its entire history; the record book was "so full of disgraceful quarrels that about 1830 some young people secretly gained possession of the records and burned them." In 1823 certain members, in despair of ever again seeing unanimity restored, withdrew and formed a Presbyterian Church with the hope that the more centralized form of government would serve to overawe contending factions in the local church. The Presbyterian records are not complete enough to convey an idea of the extent of conflict in that church. Judging from the testimony of old residents, however, quarrels were frequent enough, though they always stopped short of schism. Before the middle of the century these disputes

between church members had greatly diminished and, in the second period, had ceased entirely.

The important point about these conflicts is that very many of them originally arose out of disputes over "secular" matters, usually over property. Thus, "breach of covenant" and "not going to meeting" are recorded as causes of expulsion when the original cause arose out of a dispute over property. For instance, two brothers quarrelled over the position of a line fence. One stayed away from meeting because the other was upheld by the church, and the former was expelled for "not going to meeting."

There are several reasons for the excessive litigation in the early period? In rural populations all over the world whenever conditions so change as to stimulate aggressive self-seeking we find an increase in litigation. A period of acquisition of land, either of land in a new country or of land in an old country formerly owned by landlords, shows an increase in litigation and in drunkenness. This followed the emancipation of the serfs in Russia.[5] In America the attitude of the settler was to look out for himself aggressively, to help another on occasion but also to resist any self-seeking on the part of a neighbour at his expense. The prevalence of liquor drinking did not tend to sooth the prevailing aggressiveness. This was increased by the inevitable confusion in a new country. For instance, the lack of traditional boundary lines made disputes over property very common. In the laying out of highways there were disputes over their location. After 1845 these causes of action no longer existed. Quarrels over line fences ceased because the position of line fences had become traditional and unquestioned; and the highways had been laid out. Then, too, farmers gradually became less aggressively self-seeking. The struggle for existence was less intense. Isolation was less complete and there was a gradual broadening of interests, which gave people something to think about besides injuries imagined or real. Also the farmer felt less independent than at first. In the early days he produced about everything the family needed and, if he was so disposed, he could be at sword's points with the rest of the world without seriously impairing his prosperity. Although this state of independence is the chief advantage cited to-day when comparing farming with other vocations, yet the farmer is no longer independent. The influence of his growing dependence upon the decrease in litigation is evident from the following remark of a prosperous farmer who was a

life-long resident of our typical town, as was his father before him: "I make it a point never to have any trouble with my tenants. If I don't like a tenant I make him think I like him until his time is out and then I let him go. If I should have trouble with my tenants people would say, 'He is a hard man; he got his riches by grinding the face of the poor.' This would be unpleasant of itself, involving the accusation that I am an oppressor of the weak, and it would make it difficult for me to secure tenants for my farms." Thus the increasing dependence of the farmer on others' goodwill served to discourage litigation. As lawsuits diminished and became very unusual, public opinion more and more disapproved of them.

CHAPTER XX

POLITICAL ATTITUDES

THE political activity of the neighbourhood involved the people who were especially interested in politics and second, the mass of voters who had no interest except around election time. Those specially interested included, first, the tavern keepers who, being in the line of travel, were well informed on political gossip. Also, the tavern was a social centre of the neighbourhood and this put the keeper in a position to exert political influence. So the tavern, and in villages and cities the saloon, began to play its part in politics. Another interested class included those who aspired to hold office. The industrious farmer was averse to taking any part in politics. For this reason the office had to seek the man if it required a man of unusual integrity and sound judgment as did that of supervisor and assessor and justice of the peace. Capable farmers generally could be persuaded to run for these offices because they could so arrange their political duties as not much to interfere with their farm work. Psychologically distinct from this class of officials was the political animal, who was apt to be less conspicuous for the qualities that mark a successful farmer than for those athletic and social qualities which characterize the politician. These men won such offices as town constable and county sheriff and, too often, offices that required more capable men. Still another class interested in politics included those who were ambitious for unusual political distinction—the lawyer of recognized ability as a public speaker, the wealthy miller or distiller who, because of his business relations with a wide circle of farmers and because of his wealth and social influence, had a substantial goodwill that could be capitalized politically.

The farmers of the early days had a keener interest in local politics than later because of the practical things that they as a community needed to have done, for instance, the preservation of order among a frontier population and the laying out of highways. In local, and especially in state and national politics, farmers were intensely partisan. However, other attitudes than partisanship played a part. One of

these was local pride. A community was stirred by the prospect of having one of its citizens in the state legislature. Party lines were broken to give the community candidate a "complimentary vote." Another attitude both in local and state politics was personal allegiance. Town officers were chosen not only because of confidence in their ability to get things done but also because of their personal impressiveness. The town officers most readily and favourably recalled by old residents were "great big men," good natured, unassuming and holding their power in reserve but able on occasion to display it to advantage, particularly on election day and town meeting day. Personal power did not make a man popular, however, if he had a domineering disposition. The "big feeling" man was "taken down" at every opportunity. No aspirant for office "killed" himself so quickly as the man who, in canvassing, showed a pompous disposition. The fear and distrust of this disposition caused a general inclination to limit an office-holder's power and to limit his tenure also. This led, for instance, to the policy of some school districts of not allowing the same person to fill the office of school trustee for several consecutive terms lest he might thereby acquire undue prestige and become domineering. "Let the good thing go round" was the watchword both in school and town politics. Nothing called out a full school meeting more surely than the demand of a trustee for re-election whom it was time to put out. This local attitude was transferred to state and national politics and favourably inclined the farmers to the doctrine of rotation in office on which the spoils system was justified.

The partisan attitude and the particular party affiliation passed down from father to son. A man got his politics as he got his table manners and sectarian beliefs. And just as a person who was drawn away from his own church by an attraction in another was despised, so was the voter who was "always whipping around" and voting for one party one year and another the next. The independent voter was laughed at. What did his independent ideas amount to! The only way to count in politics was to be a member of a party.

Partisanship meant loyalty to party. Any enthusiastic loyalty involves a relation to persons. So sectarian loyalty involved loyalty to the local clergyman and to the great historical leaders of the sect; and partisan loyalty involved loyalty to the local leaders and to the great leaders of the party. This loyalty to leaders had a variety of emotional outlets. Songs and parades were more in evidence in the political campaigns of those days than to-day. Some of the behaviour

was whimsical. For instance, "The Whigs used ash for their liberty poles in honour of Henry Clay of Ashland, I suppose; while the Democrats used hickory in honour of 'Old Hickory,' General Jackson. As poles of ash could be procured which were longer and straighter than hickory poles, boys of the Whig persuasion made fun of the hickory poles. This soon created bad blood between the two parties and, not infrequently, the liberty poles were cut down in the night time—now by one party and now by another. This led to the device of inlaying the poles with horse-shoe-nail iron, with old horse-shoes and stubs of nails. Even with these precautions the poles sometimes met an untoward fate for they could be bored off near the ground or, with the help of a ladder they might be sawed off above their armour plate." [1]

Personal and party loyalty was more prominent in the early days than to-day because so little really serious attention was given to issues. People liked to listen to political orators and to argue political questions but this can hardly be called serious attention to issues. Emotional oratory played a much more prominent part in political campaigns in the early days than later. It was also more pronounced in the sermons of those days than to-day. The tendency to argue, also, was pronounced both in the church and in politics. In our typical town most neighbourhoods had Whigs and Democrats and eight neighbourhoods had taverns, so there were abundant opportunities for argument. As one old resident said, "A Whig couldn't meet a Democrat without stopping to argue." The impulse in argument was to silence the opponent. He was to be argued to the point where he "couldn't say a word." The method was to urge one's own ideas and to hold up to ridicule those of one's opponent. At the same time the disputants tried not to appear domineering. The farmer who resented the I-know-it-all attitude in another was apt to be careful not to get so carried away as to display it himself. One who did, even if he silenced an opponent, was not always at peace in his triumph and might add, "Perhaps it's just as well we don't all think alike."

Owing to the strength of adherence to beliefs the farmer had little interest in ideas as such. His interest was limited to ideas that had a very clear relation to his beliefs. So politicians presented the policies they supported in a way to give them a plausible connection with the farmer's beliefs. But almost any political policy could be thus plausibly commended to the farmer. Free trade could; protection could; internal improvements could. The farmer's interest in

political policies was not solely from the point of view of his economic interests. He did not think enough about his economic interests to know what they really were. Consequently he did not think any proposed policy through from the point of view of his economic interests. He assumed that the policies of his party, plausibly explained as for his economic interests, really were so; hence he supported his party from partisanship rather than from any insight into the relation of its policies to his interests. Politicians were careful plausibly to connect policies with his beliefs as to his interests. For instance, farmers were told not only that "protection will make us a great industrial nation," thus appealing to their national pride, but also that the factory population would increase the demand for the farmer's products.

The conclusive political argument was one that plausibly connected the political policy for which the speaker appealed with some pet formula. For instance, the free-trader declared he was for free trade because it was the policy of "fair play and every man for himself without help or hindrance." The protectionist declared for protection because "We ought to be independent of other nations." The free trade argument justified free trade by plausibly associating it with a cherished formula; the protectionist argument justified protection by associating it with another cherished formula. Thus the relative merits of the controversy were stated in a few simple sentences to the entire satisfaction of the disputants. This association of free trade and protection with pet formulas survived in political argument long after the era of cheap land, when every man could be for himself without help or hindrance, had passed, and long after the local community and the nation had passed out of the era of independence of other nations.

This simple reasoning satisfied the farmer because of his predilection for formulas and because his reasoning powers were untrained. Political problems appeared to be simple so long as he could reason by superficial association with formulas or by analogy. As an example of analogy, at the back of the farmer's mind there always was the analogy of the nation with his own community. Each little rural community was, as we have seen, largely independent of the outside-world. The nation was largely made up of these rural communities. So he could reason on the analogy of the community and the nation. As the policies of the community were based on the principle of independence and isolation so should be the policies of the nation. National issues could thus plausibly be seen in the light of the attitudes and beliefs that characterized the local community. Very seductive,

then, was the tendency to reason from analogy and its fallacy was not evident to people untrained in the economics of international trade.

Reasoning by superficial association enabled the farmer to understand and justify the policies of his party to his satisfaction and so to justify his partisanship. Partisanship made his interest in politics a sporting interest. The talk of one who backed the Republican horse with one who backed the Democratic horse resembled the talk of two men at a horse race. Each assumed the other was all wrong in his estimate of the horses. Each had a few pet ideas as a point of departure and return. The actual political situation in its broad outlines and its real significance was as unknown to them as it is to most voters to-day. Nevertheless, as long as issues had some plausible association with the beliefs and social background of the farmer's mind he thought he understood them. The association might be very superficial without disturbing his assurance. For politics were not very vital to the welfare of the farmer. Political doings were interesting matter for talk and argument after the day's work was done. So he gave his superficial reasoning processes free play. In the political speeches of the time this type of thinking was pronounced. The political orators of those days were men of a plausible "gift of gab" and the speech was such as to fit in with a torchlight procession and crowd enthusiasm. Its point of departure and return were certain beliefs and imagery of the audience. There was no disinterested attempt to enlighten the audience as to the political situation or to explain the underlying currents.

Partisanship was rendered more extreme by partisan newspapers. The newspapers owed their power to the cleverness with which their editors, for instance, those of the New York *Sun* and the New York *Tribune,* gave the issues of the parties they represented plausibility by associating them with the beliefs and imagery of the people. The *Sun* or the *Tribune* shared with the Bible the place of the inspired word in the home. On Sunday the women went in to church while the men, in many cases, stayed outside and read the *Tribune* or the *Sun* and talked politics.

Partisanship was rendered extreme, also, by extremely partisan political leaders. The most popular leaders have owed their popularity to their personal force and their uncompromising and aggressive partisanship. President Jackson was perhaps more popular among rural Democrats than has been any president before or since his time. His

popularity lay in the fact that, as one old resident expressed it, "He would do what he thought was right regardless of anything. If he wanted to pile up cotton bales and thrash the British he would do it." He was an aggressive partisan. And the people in turn, both men and women, were partisan enough to glory in an extremely partisan leader. This was true of the women as well as the men. Even Jackson's swearing did not diminish his popularity among the most pious women. Wives of Whigs, in argument with wives of Democrats, cited his terrible oath "By the eternal!" to which the reply of the most pious was, "But what is the eternal? It is only endless time."

The political theory of the early days was that, while both parties cannot be right when they take opposite sides on an issue, the ascertainment of the truth is a matter of argument rather than of thinking and investigation; wherefore, with perfect freedom of argument the truth will become evident. Hence the emphasis on saying what one thought in an argument and relentlessly attacking and pressing an opponent. This theory of the discovery of truth fitted in with the farmer's predilection for argument. Politics were for him a sporting event in which two keen arguers were matched one against the other. Obviously the theory of the ascertainment of truth by means of argument could last only so long as political situations were relatively simple and were not considered very vital for the interests of the individual. As long as the farmer produced on his own farm about all he consumed, why should he seriously care whether the country went Republican or Democratic? When later he began to realize that his economic interests were vitally involved in political issues, he ceased to be entirely satisfied with the theory that arguments between politicians could be trusted to reveal the wisdom of political policies.

The partisanship of the farmer strengthened the subservient attitude to the government referred to in the previous chapter. He would bitterly criticize the government in a time of agricultural depression when the other party was in power and then resign himself when his own party was in the saddle. The partisan attitude has made the agricultural population politically ineffective, so far as achieving its legitimate economic interests by political means is concerned.

The farmer always has had a more effective interest in local, than in state and national politics. Reforms calculated to increase the efficiency of the public service by making state and federal officers appointive instead of elective, thus making it possible to secure the

services of experts, have won little support in the rural districts. The appointment of officials has seemed to the rural voter one way of enabling a little oligarchy to appoint its favourites and thus extend its power, as indeed has often happened. The result is that the influence of the rural electorate has not made for political efficiency outside of the local administration. The administration of the assessor and the local justice has been devoid of "red tape" because, on account of the local interest, efficient men were apt to be elected to those offices. But the lack of effective political interest enabled incompetent men to get into the state and national administrations, and one result, among others, was the development of the red tape and extravagance that marks state and national administration.

The farmer's deep-seated attitude of loyalty expressed itself not only in family, sectarian and party loyalty but also in loyalty to country. The farmer was well satisfied with his country because of the economic opportunities he enjoyed, and because there was a minimum of interference by the government with his use of those opportunities. Furthermore, the farmer was conscious of possessing at least as strong a political influence as any other class. Later he was conscious of a diminishing influence owing to the increase, in the second period, of the influence of railroads and trusts over the government. Because of his satisfaction with the government he had no patience with socialistic, anarchistic or any other radical ideas. His patriotism had also an aspect that connected it with the tribal enthusiasm of the past, that is, a valorous, my-country-right-or-wrong aspect. The nationalistic outbursts of the nineteenth century centred in great demonstrations in the cities but, judging from the fulminations in the village papers, the rural districts were one with the cities in these chauvinistic expressions. This susceptibility to emotional nationalism is a trait that takes us back into the remote past. The old tribal hostility against all other tribes continued to animate the nations that were gradually formed out of the tribal groups. By the middle of the eighteenth century improvements in communication had facilitated the spread of this group emotion and, in the nineteenth century, the telegraph, the telephone and the daily newspaper still further fostered it. At the same time the rural neighbourhoods remained isolated, their chauvinism not subject to the mollifying influence of the limited contact with foreign nations which affected more cosmopolitan centres of the country. The result was that the rural districts were strongholds of nationalistic prejudice and aloofness.

CHAPTER XXI

REFLECTIONS ON EARLY RURAL LIFE; ADHERENCE TO CUSTOM

ADHERENCE to custom has characterized rural communities all over the world. The processes involved are largely subliminal. That is, custom is not followed because of conscious reasons though reasons may be assigned. When asked as to the why of their ways of doing the reply of the early farmer was, "We have always done that way." They did so because they had been in the habit of doing so from generation to generation. The present was like the past, wherefore the farmer expected the future to be like the present. This attitude to the future made suggestions of change seem hardly worth considering. Accordingly, adherence to custom may be accounted for in simple terms. Habits persist and this develops a non-expectant attitude to the future. This persistence of habits that characterize all is sanctioned by the antiquity and universal prevalence of custom, by the social pressure of all on anyone who is inclined to dissent, and by the plausible explanations of the goodness of customs. This is the nature of custom all over the world. But we are considering the adherence to custom of a rural population. Wherefore our problem involves an inquiry into the rural conditions that cause habits to persist; the problem is not cleared up until these conditions are set forth.

The essential conditions of adherence to custom of the early rural population were the uncertainty of the weather, the independence of the farmer, his isolation and the hard and confining nature of his occupation. First, as to the weather, some of the weather attitudes described in Chapter V increased adherence to custom, for instance, resignation and the centring on the process rather than on the results of work. As long as the farmer was entirely resigned to his condition, as long as he was content with a mere living and emphasized industrious working in the customary way above results, there was little incentive to change. Furthermore, as we saw, the uncertainty of the weather inclined the farmer against planning for the future, and made him indifferent to scientific knowledge; so he was inclined

to go along in the customary way. Again, the uncertainty of the weather strengthened the belief in special providence, so that a man was inclined to rely on supernatural help instead of on his own reason and his progressive impulses. Wherefore a population whose prosperity depended largely on the weather was bound to be conservative.

Aside from the weather, which is a particular aspect of physical nature, nature had a general aspect that made for conservatism. The farmer's constant contact with nature kindled a realization of the inexorableness of natural processes. This affected his attitude in his social relations and so strengthened adherence to custom. Natural processes are the same yesterday, to-day and for ever. The seasons, though uncertain, are what they are and the farmer must resign himself to the inexorable and go along in the customary way.

The second condition named was the farmer's independence. This strengthened adherence to custom. He owned his own instruments of production, could make a living beholden to no man and so was not driven by the annoyances of subjection and exploitation to question his economic and political relations. He owned his land, could easily extend his acreage, enjoyed a maximum of freedom from governmental interference in his economic life, felt that he had his proper influence over the government and so was well satisfied with things as they were.

As to isolation the farmer was little in contact with anybody outside his own family. He knew little of the outside world through newspapers and magazines. The deficiency in means of transportation prevented travelling. His essential relation was with physical nature. He felt that he must depend on himself. Hence he was self-centred and averse to discussion. He did not develop the faculty of getting another's mental background. His isolation centred his interest in his family. Religion was essentially a solicitude for the salvation of self and family. With this assured the farmer could afford to accept things as they were, for this life was short and there was a long rest ahead.

Finally, there was the confining nature of the farmer's occupation and the necessity of incessant action. Let us consider these two conditions separately. The confining nature of agriculture in the early days was due to the fact that all farmers kept live-stock. Later specialized farming developed and many farmers could leave the farm, after the crop in which they specialized was harvested, and

attend meetings for the discussion of their problems or travel and learn of the different methods of other farmers. This tended to weaken adherence to custom. But in the early days all farmers kept live-stock which required daily attention. So, in slack times, instead of getting away from his work the farmer surrendered to the promptings of his action habits and "puttered around," often about something that did not matter much. If he had a hired man he hated to see him idle, so he worked to keep him working.

Farming required incessant action. The farmer was a complex mechanism of habits of action, a magnificent muscular machine. Under long discipline of this necessity of action, and, on occasion, of extreme exertion he developed an attitude of impatience toward mere ideas. He had no time for talk and discussion. "Go ahead and do as I say" was his attitude toward his men and boys. Because of the confining nature of his occupation he never got away from this attitude. This made for extreme adherence to custom.

The effect of the farmer's struggle with nature on adherence to custom cannot be over-emphasized. Under the stress of that struggle his various attitudes had become adapted to his survival in the struggle. Any change of attitude was felt to be unsafe for a change in one would unsettle all. Parents were apprehensive as to the future of children who appeared indolent or thriftless or otherwise weak or erring as judged according to the attitudes and beliefs of the community. This feeling of apprehension was an essential element in the subliminal consciousness of the farmer. He never got away from it. "Life is a battle" is the way he expressed it. Not only must he overcome all obstacles and live an exemplary life but his children must be kept loyal to the prevailing beliefs.

There were marked contrasts in this matter of strong action. There were men of shiftless habits and these habits often passed from father to son. The two types of behaviour reacted on each other. The very active and thrifty farmer went a little further in the direction of action and thrift from his contempt for the shiftless, and the shiftless went a little further in shiftlessness from his defiance of the thrifty. A good deal of the talk of the shiftless was of the foolish thrift of the thrifty, that is, of certain extreme labour or saving that gained little or nothing, and a good deal of the talk of the thrifty was of the shiftlessness of the shiftless. Each was confirmed in his habits by his contempt for, or defiance of the other.

Defiance of those who differ was still more pronounced in adher-

ence to religious beliefs. The ancestors of many of the early settlers left Europe because of their defiance, as dissenters, of the dominant ecclesiastical organization. The keen sectarianism of different sects in the rural parts of the New World was a reflection of this Old World sectarian domination or defiance. This religious intolerance intensified adherence to particular beliefs. Once this sectarian attitude weakened, these beliefs began to lose their credibility. Defiance was marked in connection not only with religious beliefs but also with mere ways of doing. Farmers stuck to their table manners, their ways of farming all the more tenaciously because of the opposite behaviour. They ridiculed any ways contrary to their own.

Another cause of adherence to custom was the homogeneity of the rural neighbourhood. The attitudes of the farmer prevailed throughout the neighbourhood. This was because most of the families were farmers' families. The artisan, the doctor, the storekeeper, the miller and the minister were quite apt also to be farmers on a small scale. Because of the similarity of the attitudes of all, there were not the different ideas and points of view that are found among the diverse occupations of a city. This unbroken adherence to custom of the neighbourhood expressed itself as a sense of neighbourhood loyalty. The people of the neighbourhood took as a personal affront any denial, on the part of one of their number, of the truth of their beliefs or the superiority of their ways. The attitude of parents whereby they vehemently dominated a doubting child was transmuted to community relations and a dissenter was denounced and detested. "He thinks he knows it all" was the indignant reaction of the community whenever an individual differed quietly in some matter on which the community was set and thereby implied that the community did not know it all.

Another condition that intensified adherence to custom was filial loyalty. The son not only accepted the beliefs of the father but accepted them as an expression of the loyalty that a son owes a father. This was true to a degree of all beliefs and especially of religious. The son's belief in God was in his father's and his mother's God. Heaven was a place where one would meet one's parents and other loved ones. To deny God meant to give up hope of meeting them, to be disloyal to them. So family affection and loyalty intensified adherence to beliefs.

The struggle with nature developed the attitude of self-restraint that was so pronounced in early rural life. One of the essential causes

of departure from custom is a yielding to impulse and the farmer's restraint of impulse conduced to adherence to custom. He felt that he was distinguished from the impulsive working class of the cities by his self-restraint. He regarded labourers as too thriftless to save and become property owners, and as radical because jealous of property owners. His reaction against this radical or "impulsive" class still further strengthened adherence to custom.

Impulsiveness is most conspicuous in the young, self-restraint in the old. In the early community the influence of the older generation was pronounced. The boy got his vocational and character training from his father, the girl from her mother. To-day the young get their training in the schools and their ideas often differ from those of their parents. The result is a loss of authority on the part of parents. Hence the impulses of the young are less restrained, and consequently, as adults, they are less set in adherence to custom.

In spite of the self-restraint involved in the struggle with nature, the strongest tendencies of human nature were well satisfied under the prevailing customary behaviour; and adherence to custom was pronounced because of this satisfaction. Impulses for food were satisfied by abundant food, impulses for sex by early marriage, impulses for action by the active life. Acquisitive impulses were well satisfied for the farmer was contented with making a living and paying a little on the place. He had a settled home, which satisfied the homing impulse. He had numerous children which satisfied parental impulses. Impulses to avoid disapproval were easily satisfied in a group as homogeneous as the early neighbourhood. Impulses for rivalry and display were not much stimulated under the early conditions and were easily satisfied where all were too busy for much display and all were in very moderate circumstances so that none could hope for recognition of superiority beyond that of being a successful farmer. There were abundant opportunities to satisfy sympathetic impulses where the prevailing likeness of attitudes made it easy to understand one another, where substantial equality prevailed and where there was need of help at times on the part of all. Fearfulness was satisfied by faith in special providence. Because of the emphasis on action intellectual impulses were not much stimulated and were satisfied by the demands for ingenuity in performing the day's work. These satisfactions under the customary behaviour tended to strengthen adherence thereto.

The early conditions were such as to stimulate certain tendencies

that make for conformity and not to stimulate certain ones that are against it. The early rural community was an isolated group of busy workers. Conditions stimulated the acquisitive tendency, the tendency to want approval, the tendency for the familiar, and did not stimulate the rivalrous and intellectual tendencies, which make against conformity. The acquisitive tendency does not much stir the imagination, as does rivalry. It is concerned mainly with satisfying needs. The tendency to want approval prompts the suppression of differences of opinion which will incur disapproval and ridicule and the acceptance of the prevailing beliefs. The tendency for the familiar causes a dislike of new ideas and behaviour and a preference for the old and familiar. It is one of the tendencies involved in the rural dislike of foreigners. Immigration did not much tend to change customs. The immigration of the Irish and Welsh, their poverty, their brogue, their "outlandish ways," merely assured the natives of the superiority of their own ways and strengthened their adherence to custom.

Certain beliefs are particularly difficult to change because discussion of them stirs such emotion that it is difficult to think quietly. Among rural people this was and is true of beliefs about sex and about property. Furthermore, influential classes were particularly interested in maintaining beliefs about sex relations and property. The clergy were interested in maintaining sex beliefs and the landowners generally were interested in maintaining beliefs about property.

The isolation of the rural community was unfavourable to the stimulation of intellectual impulses. Children received their vocational training and their training in character from their parents. The rural school instruction consisted merely of rudiments of information. The attitudes and beliefs consciously and unconsciously inculcated in children were similar to those acquired under their parents. The formative contact of children and youths was, therefore, that with their parents and with each other. Children constantly were enjoined to do and think like their elders. Furthermore, the extreme self-restraint referred to in a preceding paragraph gave the farmer's discipline a highly emotional character. As he restrained his own unruly impulses with strong resolution, so he vehemently restrained those of his children. Disrespectful behaviour toward parents more certainly incurred punishment in those days than to-day. Corporal punishment was more common and more severe. The indignation of a parent was impressive. His whole personality expressed his indignation with a child who questioned a moral or religious belief. This restraining

attitude of parents gave a fixity to beliefs inculcated in children. These beliefs acquired in childhood remained throughout life a vital force in behaviour, especially as rural children were not much in contact with the outside world.

The limited stimulus on the intellect was due also to the fact that most knowledge was handed down as oral tradition by the parents. This was true not only of vocational but also of religious knowledge. To be sure the basis of religion was the Bible but children got their religious beliefs from the teaching of the parents and the preaching of the minister, and the Bible was not apt to be appealed to except in a controversy. Then it was interpreted in a way to justify the beliefs orally handed down. Agricultural knowledge was still more entirely a matter of oral tradition. The boy got his farm training from his father and felt that, as his father had done, so he must do. If another farmer happened to do differently in certain particulars still his way of doing was no more authoritative than that of the boy's father, and loyalty impelled him to stick to that way.

The deep-seated attitude of filial regard for parental authority continued after the parents grew old. And, because the beliefs of the younger generation diverged little from those of the older, little developed to disparage parental authority. A hale old age was one more proof of the wisdom of a custom-abiding life, as against the impulsiveness and failures of impetuous youth. Furthermore, a grandparent quite often lived in the family and the example of the respect of parents for their parents influenced the children in their impressionable years. This respect for the old in the family developed a respect for old people generally, which strengthened adherence to custom.

We have described the conditions of the rural community which combined to accentuate adherence to custom. These very favourable conditions strengthened certain psychological processes that are pronounced in conservatism. One of these is the process of slurring over unpleasant recollections. This has two distinct effects. First, it causes people to ignore unpleasant effects of customary behaviour. A *very* unpleasant experience is remembered and acted upon but less annoying experiences are slurred over and people continue to act in the customary way in spite of them. To be sure the annoyances may not be entirely forgotten but may persist as subliminal states until an accretion of these suddenly produces a radical change. This process of change is seen in the expansion of rural life which followed the customary period we are describing in this book. However, the

tendency to slur over the unpleasant greatly retards social change and makes for adherence to custom. The second effect of the slurring over is to forget unpleasant and dwell on pleasant experiences of the past. Thus the past seems more pleasant in retrospect than it really was and this tends to sanctify custom. Furthermore, there is added to this sentimental appeal of the past the thought of the many who have lived happily and died triumphantly under that culture. This sentiment for tradition was kept alive by the appeals of the clergy.

Closely connected with this sentimental support of adherence to custom was the habit of justifying customs by secondary explanations. This process of secondary explanation, or "rationalization" as it is sometimes called, was particularly important because of its prominence in religion which had a paramount place in the life of the early rural community.

Finally, adherence to custom was pronounced because of the unconscious nature of attitudes. An understanding of one's attitudes is a result of education and culture, of which there was little in the rural community. Farmers were not any more than other people conscious of the attitudes that determined their behaviour. Questions as to the why of the attitudes of others make people conscious of their own and force them to consider the why of their own. But the tendency is to justify and maintain their own unchanged. This tendency was particularly strong in the early rural population.

Because farmers were unconscious of their attitudes, the task of the student of the psychology of rural development is extremely difficult. It requires an analysis of rural attitudes; and the use of mere terms, for instance, "rural conservatism," to cover up ignorance, gets us nowhere. For instance, the farmer's opposition to governmental regulation of industry has been assigned to rural conservatism. Now there are particular attitudes that are involved in the distrust of governmental regulation. One of these is the distrust of politicians and government officials. Another is the fear of retaliation. Both these attitudes are found in early rural life and were accentuated in the course of the expansion of rural life. Politicians came to be thoroughly distrusted and the fear of retaliation increased with the increasing control of the government by railroads and manufacturers. The idea was that if manufacturers have the prices of their products fixed, they will retaliate by demanding a limit on the prices of farm products. As one farmer put it: "Once begin governmental regulation and the next thing you will have is regulation against the farmer;

and that will come just as soon as, by co-operation, the farmer has set prices in a direction advantageous to himself." One cannot explain in general terms any pronounced belief of farmers but must get at the attitudes behind the belief.

A people is conservative when its behaviour is largely determined by the stable formations we call attitudes and habits. Even the simplest habit is a complicated mechanism, much more so is an attitude. As an individual cannot break a bad habit or change an attitude merely by resolving to do so, but must put himself under the influence of new conditions and cultivate a series of new reactions, so it is with a social custom. In *The Expansion of Rural Life* we shall see that farmers could not change their customary individualism and develop co-operation merely by resolving to do so and forming organizations for that purpose. They had first to pass out of the era of isolation, to rise above the necessity of constant activity and exertion by the accumulation of some capital, and to realize that they were no longer independent. Then, as a result of these new conditions there gradually developed the new ideas and the readiness to change old ways of doing that made co-operation possible.

The culture of the early days had, then, an attitude of pronounced adherence to custom. It persisted wherever the conditions that caused it continued. The weather attitudes, isolation, a sense of independence, hard and confining farm conditions maintained this attitude in certain parts long after it had become less pronounced in others. Wherever conditions were such as to perpetuate the weakness of the reflective attitude, which, as we saw in Chapter XVIII, was the essential defect in the farmer's intellectual equipment, there the attitude against change continued. This attitude is seen in the remark of a farmer about voting on constitutional amendments. He said: "I don't understand these constitutional amendments we have to vote on. When you don't understand a thing the best way is to vote 'No.'" In the absence of power of reflection and understanding, the attitude against change asserts itself.

CHAPTER XXII

SOCIETY AND THE INDIVIDUAL

THE attitudes we have analysed were distinctly social attitudes in that they prevailed throughout the community. The development of the individual from his or her earliest years was shaped in accord with them. Yet they, in turn, were in accord with certain essential tendencies of the individual. Among these was the diurnal rhythm from action to rest, which in the last analysis is an expression of physiological processes. The family satisfied this rhythm more or less as a unit, though the family habits of action and rest might not be in entire accord with the inclinations of the individual. The farmer's day at its fullest and best was one in which the family all were in action early under the suggestion of the most positive characters, then at the close of the day, were at rest and in sympathetic intercourse, under the suggestion of the most sympathetic. The family liked harmony in these its two fundamental moods. The girl idling around during work hours was told: "For heaven's sake, Ann, get to work! I don't care what you do, but do something!" Then Ann, scolded during the working period, might at the close of the day be the most prized member of the family circle because of her restful and sympathetic qualities, and the leader in the work, still clattering in the kitchen, might be told, "For mercy's sake, Bess, come and sit down and be quiet!" The neighbourhood, as well as the family, satisfied the rhythm somewhat as a unit. An industrious farmer's family was annoyed by a neighbouring family that lacked the customary industry, and was pleased by an industrious one. And a family was immensely pleased with a neighbouring family that was "good company" after the day's work was done. The tendency throughout the neighbourhood was to be industrious during the day and good company in the evening.

Industry and neighbourliness were essential forms of social relationship. Each form expressed several elemental tendencies. Industry included assertiveness as well as acquisitiveness. A farmer industriously cultivated his fields not only in order to get a good

crop but also that they might look well or better than a neighbours. Neighbourliness, also, included a variety of elemental tendencies. The families which had a picnic at the close of the day enjoyed not only being together, that is, satisfaction of the tendency of sociability, but also the good meal. In addition each member satisfied his own personal tendencies. Some liked to sit and talk, others to play with the children, others to wander around by themselves and enjoy the beauties of the woods and the waterfall. Still others, those who had a pronounced constructive tendency, were the organizers of the occasion. They felt the responsibility of the picnic, "took it all on themselves" and the rest "let them." So they did not get as much rest as the others and were less strong for picnics. But *all* enjoyed getting together and eating. So neighbourliness satisfied certain tendencies common to all.

In social relaxation the personality did not swing free as it does in the most successful relaxation. Impulses were held in check by various social attitudes, particularly by various conventional forms of assertiveness. One of these was the assertiveness of the male sex. In the chapters on the family it was shown that male jealousy was strong and that this necessitated extreme care on the part of the wife, in her social relations. The result was a restraint on intercourse between married men and women in the social gathering. In the training of her daughters the mother emphasized the necessity of modesty, which meant not merely decent behaviour but observance of the customary female restraint in social intercourse when men were present. The result was a bashfulness on the part of girls, instead of that natural frankness where the comradely aspect of social relations is encouraged. The restraint of the girls in turn encouraged assertiveness in the boys. The relations of boys and girls did not tend to be ingenuous. Their impulses were too closely related to sex. In addition to the assertiveness and submissiveness of sex, another cause of the check on free relaxation was the assertiveness of families in their relations with one another. Neighbours were generous in time of need but, otherwise, each family was centred on its own affairs, and there was more or less rivalry, jealousy and suspicion between families. This family centredness restrained free relaxation in the social gathering.

The acquisitiveness of the family developed an organization for acquisition, which involved the action of two other elemental tendencies, assertiveness and submissiveness. Thus there developed attitudes of authority and subordination. The farmer's assertiveness took two social forms, a rivalry for superiority as compared with other heads

of families of the neighbourhood, with a desire for recognition of his superiority particularly by the members of his own family —thus he made good his position of leadership in the family; and a more direct and positive assertion against the wilfully inactive, that is, domination. Domination resulted in the submission of the less active to the influence or command of the more active and a striking superiority won the admiration of the less competent and an acquiescence in the leadership of the superior. But the assertion, particularly in the form of domination, of the most active and competent was tempered by the reaction on him of his group. The assertive father wanted peace in his family, so to a degree he had to submit.

Also, there was often assertiveness on the part of neighbours toward one another. In the neighbourhood co-operation, the most competent stood forth as leaders and others just naturally followed their directions. Another form of assertiveness was the horseplay between farmers and their rivalry in feats of work. There was also a good deal of intimidation in disputes over property. However, because of the prevailing sense of equality, there was an intense dislike of one who submitted to another's domination. There was also an intense inclination against acknowledging inferiority as a worker, and the boy of fourteen who had struggled all day to keep up his row with the men in the potato field turned from them as the tears rushed to his eyes when he saw he was falling behind. The farmer's strenuous attack on nature made the associated tendency of assertiveness pronounced and the result was a pronounced reaction on the part of the whole community against any dominating individual. So even the most assertive had to submit. Wherefore, while assertion of superiority and domination, on the one hand, and admiration for superiority and submission were in evidence, the tendencies to dispute superiority and to resist domination were pronounced.

The impulses of social intercourse, also, involved the reaction of some individuals on others. Social intercourse stimulated a cheeriness and generosity that infected the passively social. The assertive person in a social gathering spoiled the occasion but the company had to be enlivened and the one who was "the life of the company" was the cheery, generous person whose laugh was infectious and at the same time not at the expense of another, whose humour was mirth-provoking and not the wit or the pun-making that seeks attention. This good cheer and humour resulted in the warming of the less toward the more social. By way of summary, then, we may say that the main charac-

teristics of power of social suggestion in the rural group were the competence that stirs admiration, the domination that compels submission and the cheeriness and generosity that win devotion.

The form of leadership most effective with the farmer was one that combined these qualities. The minister of influence was one whose force won admiration and who assumed a dominating attitude toward sinners. His manner was direct, attitude tense, voice stentorian and gestures "straight from the shoulder." The minister must be powerful and direct but that was not all. He must be a tender shepherd, bearing in his great heart the troubles of all his flock and presenting these severally before the "throne of grace." It was this ready compassion and generous attitude on behalf of all that endeared him to his people.

Religion served these two sides of human nature. It assisted the farmer to assert himself above the troubles, hardships and disappointments of life, and there developed a distinct attitude of self-assertion by means of religious symbols. The contemplation of a mighty God on his side gave the farmer some feeling of might. It also assisted the tendency to feel divine love and protection and to be soothed to rest by this thought; thus there developed a distinct attitude of self-comfort by means of religious symbols.

The psychology of the early American neighbourhood differed from that of a primitive group that lived by hunting as well as agriculture, not only in the fact that its assertiveness expressed itself in different attitudes but also in the fact that its assertiveness was somewhat less pronounced than that of the primitive group. The hunting and war parties of primitive man gave more opportunities for assertiveness than the peaceful cultivation of the soil gave the farmer. While strenuous acquisitiveness stimulates the associated tendency of assertiveness, yet the isolated life and the constant industriousness of the farmer left him little time for assertiveness and offered little stimulus to it. He had the tendency strong but the attitudes were not pronounced or varied. However there were forms of assertiveness in the family and the neighbourhood, as already stated, and there were also two vents that the farmer's neighbourhood had in common with the primitive tribe, that is, patriotism and sectarianism. The intensity of these forms of intolerance among a rural population evidences, among other things, a strong and inadequately socialized assertiveness. Patriotism and sectarianism were vented rather than socially expressed assertiveness.

The economic situation of the early American farmer differed from

that of the European peasant in that the American neighbourhood was a group of independent men all of whom might and most of whom did own land. The abundance of cheap land resulted in a good degree of economic equality and the result was the tendency of the farmer to regard himself as good as anybody else and to resent any "uppishness" in another. So the "big feeling" farmer was not liked, nor was the too submissive farmer. Domination and submissiveness were avoided and the attitude that won esteem was that of the farmer who limited his assertiveness to the defence of his rights and, day after day, "kept right on sawing wood" without paying attention to what somebody else was doing. The esteemed man was the one who could mind his own business and at the same time had the assurance of the mighty worker and the generosity of the good neighbour.

Ownership of property stimulated assertiveness. In the family the farmer's assertiveness was strengthened by the fact that he owned the property. And, if a question of superiority happened to arise in the neighbourhood, the successful farmer took a grim satisfaction in the reflection that his success spoke for itself. Ownership affected also the sociable tendency, as seen in the benign expression of the man of property—"the graciousness of conscious power." Even the farmer who had not much property but merely owned a little farm showed a degree of assertiveness. His sense of his independence of other men rested on his ownership for, because of that ownership, he "could make a living beholden to no man." The independent farmer resisted domination, without wanting to dominate, because he did not want to submit. He resisted a demonstration of competence, without wanting to be superior, because he did not want to feel inferior to another. His characteristic attitude was not one of pride of superiority or one of domination but one of resistance of these attitudes in another.

The resistfulness of the rank and file of farmers is to be distinguished from the resistfulness of a progressive rural leadership. That of the rank and file springs from their independent ownership of land. Farmers who own their own land and are intent on its cultivation do not like to take orders from another. They are impatient with the man who jumps over the fence and starts in to tell the farmer how to raise his crop. They are impatient with government restrictions. That is, where you have a group of men who have long enjoyed independent ownership, there is an underlying disposition to resist anything that interferes with what they want to do.

This form of resistfulness may be called independence. Another form is that of a small group of "progressive" farmers who are resistful not merely because of assertiveness but because of the voltage of that group of tendencies that beget a lively regard for the public welfare and social progress.

The American farmer knew less of submission than the peasant on a landlord's estate. To be sure we must not forget that relations with physical nature, as well as relations with human beings, beget submission. The farmer often found that natural processes were inexorable and that he had to resign himself to unfavourable weather. "We have to take it as it comes," he said. So the independent farmer resembled the European peasant in the resignation that comes of dependence on the weather, if not in the submissiveness that is fostered by dependence on other human beings. The American farmer's ownership of land favoured assertiveness and his isolated position favoured the resistance form of assertiveness in that isolation compelled self-reliance and other resistful qualities. To be sure he wanted the approval of his neighbourhood but he was less socially regardful than the peasants of Europe who live in hamlets, and less so than the modern industrial worker who goes with his group rather than be called a scab.

The assertiveness of the farmer, then, mainly took the form of resistance of encroachments on his free pursuit of his acquisitive interests. But it was seen also in connection with sociability. In this connection it led the farmer to persist in his own manners and social usages in defiance of village and city ways. For instance, the farmer noticed the mincing manners of the city person at table and said with a laugh, "Pitch in, don't be bashful." He disliked "putting on" in talk and said to his boy who was going away to school, "Don't come back with your mouth full of mush." Especially did he dislike "new fangled" singing. This was due, in part, to his preference for the old familiar songs but not entirely, for a new simple song was enjoyed. But the trills and high notes and dramatic action of the concert singer were put down as just plain showing off. Now the reason for this aversion to assertiveness in social intercourse and for the tendency to see it where possibly it did not exist was that it destroyed the comradeship in social intercourse that was so dear to him. So he was especially averse to it in eating manners, in talking and in singing.

The farmer's resistfulness sometimes ran away beyond the bounds prescribed by competence in work or by common sense in social inter-

course. Much naïve social enjoyment in new ways he regarded as assertive just because the ways were new. And in the family work and planning often he was stubborn in insisting on his right to be consulted and to have his way followed. In neighbourhood relations, also, the farmer was apt to be stubborn in defence of his rights, often beyond reason. Because his assertiveness had the solid basis of land ownership, it made him an individualist to such an extent that, when co-operation began to be tried, he was inclined to leave a co-operative enterprise when it suited his personal advantage even though he thereby won the ill-will of the whole community. He was not dependent on his group for protection against hostile tribes, as was primitive man, or for protection against an employer, as is the modern industrial worker. But his assertiveness got a jolt as soon as he discerned his dependence on his group for protection against the dealer in farm produce, and the more clearly he discerned this situation the more disposed he was to acquiesce in the regulations of his co-operative organization.

We have said that assertiveness did not have a pronounced or varied social expression in the early days. Nevertheless it did have some social expression. Its objectives were the physical expression, the skill and strength in work, the achievements in production and in accumulation of wealth, and the other objectives that had come to be socially regarded as signifying superiority. While acquisitiveness was more pronounced than assertiveness and assertiveness depended a good deal on the results of acquisitiveness, particularly on ownership of real estate and on the attitudes that became pronounced in the mighty worker, at the same time assertiveness depended also on the social standing of one's family. The social standing of the neighbourhood and the community also satisfied assertiveness to some degree so that neighbourhood and community superiority was, in a minor degree, an objective; and this prestige value of group memberships extended even to the state and nation. The individual was thus subjected to a wide range of social standards in satisfaction of assertiveness. Essential among the things that "set up" the family in the community was wealth in the various forms that evidenced material prosperity. All members of the family responded to this ambition for a creditable standing of the family in the community. In the second period, as we shall see, assertiveness became even more prominent as compared with acquisitiveness and the result was an increasing tendency not to be

satisfied with mere ownership of real estate and money in the bank but to spend more money for means of social recognition.

We have centred on three elemental tendencies that determined social relationship in the early community, acquisitiveness, assertiveness and sociability. There were others but these were fundamental. The acquisitive tendency took the social form of industriousness, which, however, included assertiveness and other elemental tendencies. The assertive tendency took mainly the social form of resistance or sense of independence, which, however, included other elemental tendencies. The sociable tendency took the form of neighbourliness, which, also, involved other tendencies. The task of social-psychological analysis involves analysing the essential social forms of behaviour into their constituent elemental tendencies. In addition to the three elemental tendencies above noted others have been mentioned in the course of this work—the tendency for the familiar, the constructive tendency and others. The social forms of behaviour involve connections of all these tendencies but only the main connections can be detected. Also the conditions, material and non-material, that determine what tendencies shall be stimulated and what connections made are to be studied with a view to learning what social psychology has to teach as to the conditions of progress. The tendencies and connections that are essential under certain conditions, for instance, the conditions of the American farmer, may not be essential under others, for instance, those of the primitive tribe or those of manufacturing industry. It is necessary to make intensive studies of typical groups of all kinds. Social psychology can centre on the individual and explain how the mental mechanisms of the individual function in various social situations or it can begin with an analysis of the attitudes and beliefs that are early acquired by the individual and explain the tendencies and connections involved. The latter seems to me the more strictly scientific procedure. It requires extensive research. The student should centre on particular communities and should also extend his comparative studies among communities as widely as possible. Even in rural communities of New York, acquisitiveness was not equally predominant in all. Some communities had a more practical religion than others, that is, religion was more subordinated to the acquisitive tendency in some communities than in others. In the latter industriousness was not so extreme that a man would not leave his work in the middle of the week to go to a religious service. In these communities religious assertiveness was pronounced

and religion took a more demonstrative form; in the other communities assertiveness was more intent on a material satisfaction. It is necessary to conduct the analysis by communities and thus to get at the predominant tendencies of particular communities and then compare them.

CHAPTER XXIII

SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND CONFLICT

Social Consciousness

SOCIAL processes are more largely subliminal than clearly concious. This was particularly true of processes of the early neighbourhood. From the time the child was born into the culture of a neighbourhood, its rearing was a process of bringing its impulses into accord with the attitudes and beliefs of its elders. It gradually acquired a sense of the opposition of its childish impulses to the will of its parents, and, therefore, developed an opposition or a suggestibility to parents according to whether it was temperamentally perverse or tractable. But, whatever its temperament, the child gradually developed attitudes that harmonized with at least a substantial part of the culture of the neighbourhood. There were adults that remained unlike their fellows because of certain pronounced impulses that gave them distinctly personal attitudes. But most people were made by their environment. The prevailing consciousness was, then, for the most part, not the clear consciousness of personal impulses and ideas in conflict with prevailing attitudes but the subliminal consciousness of behaviour in conformity therewith.

In addition to this subliminal consciousness that accompanied the formations whereby the individual was identified with his group, there was the more pronounced consciousness involved in certain processes. The farmer was not merely a part of a group but his assertiveness impelled him to be a prominent part, to be a man of influence, an exemplary citizen. The youth was enjoined by his parents not to do anything to "hurt his influence"; and those who spoke in eulogistic terms of the man who had died called him an exemplary citizen. This urge for influence developed in many people into a pronounced attitude for social recognition. Unlike the attitude for a particular kind of response from a certain individual,[1] it is an attitude for the admiration of the community in general, though the recognition of people of prestige and particularly of one's rivals is especially gratifying. This

urge for recognition would give almost any attitude, ordinarily subliminal, which it was sought to get recognized, a conscious aspect. For instance, the honest man was not ordinarily conscious of his honesty. He merely acted in that way. But the impulse to stand out as honest in an exemplary way prompted one, when he heard of the dishonesty of another, to react with abhorrence. Sometimes this seemed like a too ready belief in another's dishonesty, as if the impulse to appear to be exemplary in honesty got the best of cautious fairness to the person accused.

While many social attitudes were not clearly conscious to those actuated by them, some were held as cherished beliefs and emphasized as principles of action. For instance, loyalty was emphasized as a principle of action, and there was a pronounced belief in family loyalty, neighbourhood loyalty, loyalty to one's church, loyalty to one's political party. A man was expected to stick to his own home and not to go into other people's homes or allow other people to come into his except according to the neighbourhood customs of social intercourse. A man was expected to "stick up for" his neighbourhood. It was a prevailing belief that the church member "should stick to his own church." This loyalty to church, like that to family and to neighbourhood, was intensified by the reaction of the community against one who showed a conspicuous lack of it and also by the individual's reaction upon the community under the impulse for recognition. Because the community approved of a man who showed an attitude of loyalty to his church, church members aimed to be conspicuous for loyalty. And because the community disapproved of sectarianism going beyond certain limits, that is, to the point of "talking down" another sect or members thereof, church members who aimed to be exemplary citizens avoided such behaviour and maintained a dignified loyalty. A man was expected to be loyal to his party and not to "go whipping around and voting one ticket one year and another the next." To have voted for the candidates of another party even once spoiled a man's chances of being nominated to office by his own party. Because of the prevailing belief in partisanship, exemplary citizens were careful to maintain a dignified loyalty to party and to avoid the extreme partisanship that was socially disapproved. Thus there was a belief in loyalty as a principle of action and this led to particular cherished loyalties.

The underlying attitude of loyalty was related to another fundamental disposition—self-restraint. Self-restraint led not only to the denial of impulses that had to do with material things but also to the

denial of impulses that had to do with other people. A man should deny a liking for other women and be loyal to his wife; should deny a liking for other children and be loyal to his own; should deny impulses to be attracted by another church, or another neighbourhood or another party. So loyalty involved self-restraint. It might also involve the more conspicuous feature of praising wife or children before others or "talking up" the church or the neighbourhood. This was especially marked among those who aimed to be conspicuous for loyalty. The relation of loyalty to self-restraint comes out especially in loyalty to a spouse. The prevailing attitude was that no matter how difficult to live with a woman might be, her husband must continue to live with her, and no matter how difficult to live with a man might be, his wife must continue to live with him. Unless husband or wife was guilty of wrong relations with one of another sex, each must "bear and forbear" and "try to get along with" the other. Let one in sympathy with an aggrieved husband recount the trials of living with the wife and he would meet with the short rejoinder, "Well, he married her!" That settled it. What was now required of him was to endure the woman he married. And, if it was the wife who was aggrieved, "Well, she married him!" settled it for her. She must live with him and endure him. There was abundant sympathy for the aggrieved party. The gossip of the community pretty thoroughly thrashed out the question as to which was to be pitied and the pity was genuine. But no matter how much he or she was pitied, the attitude was that the aggrieved must live with the other and do the best he or she could. Which was to be pitied was decided not according to justice as it would appear to a sensitive and discriminating person but according to the social attitudes; then out of the fundamental disposition of self-restraint of the community came the reaction. The aggrieved must repress his or her impulses to get away from a situation fraught with annoyance and suppression and endure the other. Thus loyalty, in the last analysis, had a connection with a disposition developed primarily by economic conditions—self-restraint. When economic conditions changed and self-restraint weakened, so did loyalty. Prosperity caused children to be brought up less to self-restraint and more to self-indulgence. These self-indulgent young people in their courting "went with those who would give them the best time." In choosing a mate for life they were quite apt to choose from this attitude. That is, they were thinking what they would get out of the relation for themselves. Because of this lack of self-restraint, there was more apt to be griev-

ances after marriage and less apt to be loyalty in the old sense than in the old days of rearing in self-restraint.

The shaping of the characters of the people in accordance with the social attitudes was fostered by clergymen through giving the attitudes a great variety of prestige connections, among these a connection with some large purpose.[2] For instance, diaries kept by people of the early days contain fragments of sermons glorifying certain behaviour and concluding with a peroration something like this: "When the pioneers travelled westward to hew out of the wilderness their farms and their homes it was with a faith in God that enabled them to overcome every hardship. In that faith the settler toiled on when otherwise he would have faltered. And his wife stood by his side with a power of self-sacrifice equal to his; for she knew they were laying the foundations of a commonwealth." Here we see the attitudes of self-restraint and loyalty associated with the large purpose of laying the foundations of a commonwealth. Now, of course, the pioneer, as he felled the trees and cut the logs for his cabin, did not think of laying the foundations of a commonwealth. He thought only of building his log house. His thoughts seldom went beyond the horizon of his neighbourhood. But, under the inspiration of the preacher, the social consciousness did, at times, extend beyond the neighbourhood and the community and this stretch of imagination put new enthusiasm into the attitudes thus glorified.

The attitudes tended to become more clearly conscious before the opposite behaviour in another, because of the tendency to justify one's behaviour. This inevitably made one more or less conscious of the attitudes underlying the challenged behaviour. When, in the second period, in spite of justifications the traditional behaviour began to change in response to changed economic and other conditions, the changes were not deliberated and consciously adopted. People drifted into them. When parents who were opposed to their children's dancing finally yielded they yielded without any deliberation. To be sure they found some "reason" for their consent, just as previously they had had some justification of their refusal. When a line of conduct had become prevalent it was as easy to find reasons for it as before it had been easy to find reasons against it. For, in the absence of any definite knowledge of the conditions of development of personality and of social progress, attitudes are not developments from an ideal of personality and progress so much as mere ways of reacting, justified on the ground that we always have done so or that everybody is doing so

or that influential people are doing so or that we have been taught that we should do so. When behaviour contrary to that of the traditional attitudes is becoming prevalent, those who are particularly defiant of the new behaviour are apt to be those who have held positions as guardians of morality, as school teachers and the clergy. Thus an old school teacher remarked: "I tell you it's hard to live through as many changes as I have." She meant it was hard to see the attitudes of people changing all around her and still maintain her own unchanged and thereby lose the prestige she had enjoyed as an exemplar of approved behaviour.

Social Conflict

Social consciousness was most intense when attitudes conflicted. The essential conflicts were between underlying social forms or dispositions that involved contrary elemental tendencies. Essential among these essential conflicts was that between dispositions which seek satisfaction of self regardless of the satisfaction of others and the sympathetic disposition which is satisfied only by having the objects of its attention satisfied and happy.[3] The conflict between these two classes of dispositions extended through all aspects of social organization.

Conflict in Family Relations

The sexual and economic domination of the husband, supported by religious and legal tradition, resulted in a more or less annoying subjection of the wife. In addition to burdening her with the care of an unnecessarily large family, this subjection threw upon her shoulders a burden of farm work that taxed the strength even of the strongest. The husband was apt to be centred in the accumulation of wealth rather than in the happiness of his wife. A wife, moved more strongly by the sympathetic disposition than her acquisitive husband, craved other satisfactions than that of accumulation and the result was a lack of congeniality and, often, a pronounced difference of opinion in which conflict was avoided only by the wife yielding to the husband.

Their attitudes to the children also conflicted. The father insisted that the boy work to the limit of endurance. Even if the boy showed unusual mental ability, the father saw no reason why he should not look forward to the life of a farmer or to going into the local

bank or into the store as a clerk, while the mother often desired him to "aim higher." [4] Neither of them necessarily understood the child, but the mother wanted to do more for him than the father. The mother's sympathetic inclination might be merely to adore and indulge her children,[5] though this was uncommon in the rural parts, or it might be an attitude of intelligent understanding. The inevitable result of a difference of attitude on the part of parents toward the children was a conflict in their rearing. Essentially it was a conflict between the egoistic disposition of the father and the sympathetic disposition of the mother.

Conflict in Economic Relations

In the early period farmers were overwhelmed with work and often were dependent on the help of neighbours, and there was always a conflict between the disposition to help others and the disposition to be centred on one's own work. Some farmers calculated the time another worked for them and gave the exact equivalent in return, while others generously disdained any such small business. These two dispositions, the acquisitive and the sympathetic, conflicted in the same man, but the tendency was for either the one or the other characteristically to mark the behaviour of an individual. The sympathetic farmer, in his dealings with another, did not go as far in shrewd and sharp practice as the unsympathetic. He did not work his wife and boys so hard.

The tendency in the giving of help to give only as much as had been received developed as the neighbourhood consciousness weakened. As the farmer felt less dependent on his neighbours, he became more inclined to think only of the particular service rendered and not to let himself be moved by a neighbourly attitude of reciprocal helpfulness. He became more inclined to think of his neighbours as looking out for themselves, first and last, and to think of himself as entitled to do the same. If a farmer appeared genuinely generous in his behaviour then the tendency was either tentatively to accept his attitude and react in the same spirit or selfishly to take advantage of it.

Conflict in Social Relations

In the casual relations of the neighbourhood and in the social gatherings there was always the contrast between the kindly man or woman

with a cheery word for everybody, and the self-centred or proud individual, between one who could "make himself agreeable" and one who "always was rubbing people the wrong way." The social favourite was the one who could cheer another with his hearty laugh, who laughed whether he felt like it or not and habitually sought to make others happy. Often this sort of man was strongly disapproved of by the man bent on acquisition of wealth, while the former would good-naturedly joke at the latter's self-centred characteristics: "He wouldn't stop and laugh for fear he would lose a minute."

Conflict in Political Relations

In the early period, as later, there were two types of politicians, the few who were genuinely interested in the welfare of their constituents and those who were primarily seeking a career and self-aggrandizement. Self-seeking politicians cultivated the sympathetic appeal. No appeal of the candidate for office, on election day, was more moving than this, whispered close to the voter as he passed into the polling place: "Remember me to-day, John. I've got to earn bread for my children." The successful politician was genial and jovial to meet, a magnanimous opponent and generous in acknowledging the help of supporters in winning an office. While these characteristics were cultivated as a means of winning office, they were most winningly displayed by men of a genuinely sympathetic disposition because in such men they had the aspect of sincerity. The politician of this disposition found himself in conflict with the self-seeking politician. The conflict between Lincoln and Douglas, in its deeper significance,[6] was repeated in a small way, again and again, throughout the rural districts.

Conflict in Ecclesiastical Relations

The cultivation of the sympathetic disposition was a subject of frequent exhortation on the part of the clergy. For instance: "He whose tender mercies are over all His works hath placed a principle in the human mind, which incites to exercise goodness towards every living creature; and this being singly attended to, people become tender-hearted and sympathizing, but when frequently and totally rejected, the mind becomes shut up in a contrary disposition."[7] In spite of exhortations to cultivate a sympathetic disposition, however, because

egoistic attitudes predominated in family, economic and other relations, and because the church championed these traditional relations its influence was largely on the side of the egoistic attitudes.[8] The minister championed the subjection of wife to husband. He did not particularly emphasize sympathy in economic relations, for the shrewd and successful farmers were pillars of the church and were not conspicuous for sympathy. Furthermore, sympathetic farmers were sometimes inclined to conviviality, instead of to that extreme austerity for which the church stood. However, the church had its sympathetic members and their pronounced sympathy brought them into conflict with those in whom egoistic attitudes predominated. In the church conflicts referred to in a preceding chapter, these sympathetic members pleaded with the angry belligerents "for the love of Christ to forget their differences."

Self-realization

The personality of the farmer was a result of the attitudes developed by a long day of action succeeded by a brief period of relaxation at its close. There was a diurnal rhythm from the processes of action to the processes of relaxation. I worked, in the second period, with one of these old farmers of the first and noted the attitudes and ideas involved in this rhythm of personality. At the beginning of the day he had the day's work "on his mind" as a leading idea to be corroborated by the working out of all the details. He wanted to see his work done. When in this working mood anything that interfered with its accomplishment was inhibited—even the love pats of his daughter; all the joys that would be welcomed at the close of the day were swept aside. In the process of work, however, his attention frequently lapsed. His movements often slowed down. In these intervals of lapse ideas passed before his mind and he talked of his neighbours, their holdings and crops, and the reactions to these assertion-provoking ideas were shunted into his process of work and quickened his movements. Then came another lapse. He talked of himself, of his fidelity to his word, of the dishonesty of some people and those ideas in turn quickened his work movements. As the day wore on this type of ideas diminished. The lapses of attention and of work movements were more pronounced. A different type of ideas began to appear. There were thoughts of his home and the peace-giving ideas of his religion. Finally these ideas had their way with him. His day's work

was done and he turned homeward with a feeling of satisfaction. In this expansive mood he sought the companionship of his wife and family, told of the work done, enjoyed her satisfaction at his work and shared hers at her own. The wife's commendation and caresses gave the desired stimulus to the rhythm from the tension of the day's work to the relaxation of evening. When telling of the day's work the farmer omitted annoying experiences not in harmony with the mood of relaxation. Or, if these experiences were very pronounced he told of his failures, that his wife's sympathy might bring relief. In the evening he gathered his children around him or read his Bible. Thus the parental tendency, the gregarious tendency which finds satisfaction in a large family and other tendencies combined to reinforce the expansive mood. The evening meal was apt to be a little more aesthetic than others, that is, to include little delicacies, to be eaten more leisurely and with more attention to "manners." The farmer was less apt to want tension-causing foods, as meat, at the evening meal. Thus in his working mood, assertive ideas and attitudes moved him and quickened his work movements, while, in his expansive mood, sympathetic ideas and attitudes contributed to the realization of this side of his personality. He thus, in a certain sense, unconsciously gathered up the social attitudes and experiences in the processes of his own self-realization. His capacity for self-realization depended in good part on these materials furnished by his environment.

The conflict of dispositions which we traced in the preceding sections centred in the family. There relations were most intimate and the annoyance of conflict was keenest. The farmer could endure with equanimity a grasping neighbour or a slandering neighbour if only his family relations were harmonious. Consequently it was in the family that people really tried, more or less, to understand one another and to live harmoniously. In spite of the strenuous economic life of the family and the rigorous discipline of the father, there was a good deal of mutual adjustment for the sake of peace and contentment. That is, the family was the sphere in which sympathy, in the broad sense of the term, was most effectively worked out. Some one figure, usually the mother, sometimes the father, stood for this ideal of sympathy before the other members and was looked to as the adjuster of differences, the tranquillizer, the fountain of love that settled the troubled waters of family life. And she or he, in turn, often had to look up for strength to the unseen source of love and tranquillity. Sometimes, however, it was this tranquillizer in the lesser difficulties who sank

under a severe bereavement and then the more forceful, positive character became the family's strong tower.

The family cultivated sympathy as the background of family life. Assertiveness is an experience of tension, as compared with the relaxation of sympathy. So parents constantly tried to temper their assertion with love. The father punished in love and not in anger, or tried to. This attitude was extended to neighbourhood relations. The minister admonished sinners in love, at least he professed to, and tried to make practice accord with profession. Instead of harshly condemning the self-indulgence or laziness of a neighbour, the farmer tried to school himself to pity him, as more in accord with the Christian spirit and more satisfying to his own peace of soul.

However, sympathy in community relations was less a matter of understanding adjustment than in the family and more a process of a sympathetic sharing of the emotions of neighbours. The rural person was one of deep feeling in that his or her attitudes centred around the family and the neighbours so that all the force of the impulses of the man or woman was expressed in a comparatively few deep-seated attitudes. It is for this reason among others that a bereavement in a neighbour's family stirred the emotions more deeply than such an occurrence does in a city. A person of pronounced rural attitudes is sometimes shocked at the unfeeling references of city people to a bereaved family. Where people have a great variety of social contacts and distractions, a particular stimulus has less chance of stirring a powerful and absorbing emotion than where there are no distractions. As economic and social inequality increased among neighbours this emotional sympathy diminished.

In the early neighbourhood the farmer and his wife had two effective means of easing the annoyances resulting from family conflict and neighbourhood differences. These were the routine of daily work and religion. Out on his land by himself the farmer could vent his feelings in his work and in her housework or garden the wife could do the same. It was not that they *could* work and so ease an emotional state if they felt disposed but that they *had to* work, so that the emotional state had to give way. That is, the necessity of constant work took their minds off themselves and so eased the strain of resentment or self-pity. So there developed a sort of practical attitude toward moods and grievances: "Go to work and forget it." If there was any person that the typical farmer or farmer's wife had no patience with it was the moody man or woman, who wilfully nursed a grievance

and would not talk about it, who acted the martyr "but kept up a devil of a thinking." We have said that the farmer was more or less given to grouches. This was more true during the long winter when there was comparatively little to do and when the digestive organs of the hearty eater got out of order than during the working months. But of course isolation is more favourable to the nursing of grievances than an environment where it is easy to enjoy social distractions.

Another means of escaping the annoyances of conflict was religion. The person unjustly treated tried to find in his or her religion a realization of impulses denied satisfaction in the family and neighbourhood life. Because the economic attitudes had so essential a place even in the family life, and because they represented for the most part acquisitiveness, assertiveness, submission, pugnacity, and crowded into a corner generosity, cheeriness, a sense of protecting love, an appreciation of beauty, the ideas and beliefs of religion most fondly clung to by the sensitive person were those that gave these sympathetic and aesthetic satisfactions. So there was always a fundamental tendency to oppose the material to the non-material, the secular to the sacred, the worldly to the spiritual life.

CHAPTER XXIV

ECONOMIC INTERPRETATIONS

THE preceding chapters have suggested the paramount importance of adjustment to the material environment as the essential process determining the attitudes of the farmer. The conditions repeatedly cited as essential in the determination of distinctively rural attitudes are: the uncertainty of the fruition of crops due to the uncertainty of the weather; the close contact of the farmer with nature and his constant exposure to uncertain weather; his isolation; his independence due to ownership of the means of production; the confining nature of his occupation; the necessity of constant action, often of excessive exertion. All these are material conditions except isolation which, however, was a necessary result of adjustment to the material environment.

Rural adjustment was, to be sure, conditioned not only by existing conditions but also by attitudes and beliefs inherited from the past. But these were, in the last analysis, determined by material conditions of the past and tended to change in adaptation to the existing conditions. Even the submission of the wife, and religious submission, as we saw, became less abject in the course of adaptation to the new conditions of American life. Those conditions gave a practical turn even to attitudes that had developed in reaction to the idea of a future life.

The attitude of adherence to custom was itself due to economic conditions. That is, the essential causes of the adherence were economic. Take isolation. There were families which seemed to prefer isolation for its own sake and there were others which wanted it to safeguard their children against religious beliefs contrary to their own, but the prevailing reason for isolation seems to have been the lure of wealth to be gained in the remote parts. The unceasing work, also, made for adherence to custom. This was due, likewise, to economic conditions. The farmer's work drove him and the wife was even more driven. They had "no time to think" unless forced to it by some crisis. The confining nature of the farmer's work also made for adherence to custom. So did his economic independence. These are

economic conditions that have made for adherence to custom among rural populations generally. In New York, as shown in Chapter IV, there were also particular physical conditions that accentuated adherence to custom, as the wide extent of hill country and the humid atmosphere and cloudy sky. Furthermore, it was economic conditions that caused the more enterprising and restless of the young New York farmers to migrate west, thereby making the population left behind still more conservative.

To be sure farmers differed in the degree of adherence to custom even where economic conditions were pretty much the same. These individual differences no environmental influence accounts for. But the unusually intelligent farmer profited by his intelligence in a material way. It was by successful farming that intelligence manifested itself and was generally accredited. However, most farmers quite blindly persisted in the customary ways of satisfying their economic interests. Farmers saw new pests and diseases injuring their crops without doing anything but complain until the adoption of a remedy had been given an impetus by certain leading farmers. This adherence to custom has been urged as disproving the economic interpretation, but it was due not to the farmer's indifference to his economic interests but to his persistence in old ways of seeking his economic interests. In his ignorance he did not know what his economic interests, under new conditions, really were.

Certain attitudes of fundamental importance in early rural life were determined by economic conditions. We cited attitudes that developed out of the uncertainty of the weather. The influence of these permeated every part of the social organization—family, community, religion, politics, education. Even the farmer's relation to his wife and children was more or less economic and his attitude to them largely determined their attitudes to him. To be sure their relations were a good deal determined by tradition but the traditional attitudes were those of a farming community. Sympathy of course entered into family behaviour, but the prevailing behaviour was not determined by sympathy. This fact came out incidentally in impatient criticisms of behaviour, for instance, "A farmer will work his boys to death and then if one gets stomach trouble, he'll spend a fortune trying to get him cured." That is, the farmer's attitude was ordinarily determined by his economic interests, but, on occasion, he let his sympathies have their way with him even to the extent of spending a good deal of the hard-earned money. So fundamental was the economic determin-

ism in the family that when economic conditions so changed that children failed to develop the customary attitudes, this resulted in marked changes in community, religious and juristic attitudes. Because of the economic determinism, as well as for other reasons, all classes of attitudes of rural character are more or less intimately related. This is true of other than rural populations. The problem of the reconstruction of personality is, then, not a matter of correcting any attitude separately but of considering all as a closely related whole.

The moral standards of the neighbourhood adapted the farmer's family to its material situation. Of course there are aspects of family and neighbourhood behaviour that cannot be thus explained, as the sympathy of neighbour for neighbour in sickness, disaster, bereavement. But the prevailing behaviour was not determined by sympathy. Furthermore, the sympathy that was customary fitted the sympathetic individual to survive, for it won him friends who were ready to help him in time of need. The moral standards of the community for the most part fitted the family to survive in the struggle for subsistence. Furthermore, the men who were held up as moral examplars, who had the influence in the community, were the men who excelled in the qualities that make a man an economic success.

The theology inherited by the rural districts emphasized crucifying the things of the flesh. But to the farmer the flesh meant the appetites and desires that interfered with the self-restraint necessary for efficient work. While the exponents of religion emphasized its subjective side, as opposed to the objective and material, to the farmer religion did not by any means mean a renunciation of wealth or wealth getting. Hence, though the exponents of religion would frown on an economic interpretation of religion, that interpretation rests on the attitudes of the mass of farmers, not on those of the exponents of religion. The religious attitudes and beliefs of the farmer had these economic aspects. He believed the church was necessary to the peace and order of a population that was more or less self-willed in its pursuit of wealth. He believed the church made the community a better place to live in and thus indirectly increased the value of his land. He believed it helped him in bringing up his children, particularly in inculcating the self-restraint that was necessary if they were to grow up to be responsible workers. He believed God prospered in a material way the man who supported the church. He knew that religion helped him become resigned to disappointments because of a bad season or bad luck. In contrast with these objective aspects of

religion there was its subjective aspect. Essential in the religious life was the idea of another life in which man would rest from his labours. So religion was opposed to the material life in that it was subjective, not objective; it was a means of getting away from that sphere of life that had to do with work for material ends. So it was said, "A man cannot pay for his religion." It was entirely different from what men pay for. It was an attitude to the unseen, the future life, and it did not have to do, primarily, with the material and objective things of this life. It was a point of departure for a series of ideas subjectively determined and more or less opposed to the objective world. And the beings of the future were thought of as non-material, as contrasted with those of objective experience. Religion was a means of satisfying people about the future life, particularly by giving assurance of a reunited family. However, religion was not divorced from the economic life. Men paid for church services and there was an increasing emphasis on the material aspects of these services. It was an axiom that a prosperous rural church requires a prosperous rural community. It was the prosperous farmer, whose religion was a practical matter of church attendance and respectable living, rather than of a spiritual relation with the unseen, who had the influence in the church. In the second and third periods as the farmer became less solitary and more absorbed in his business and social contacts and his material enjoyments, he became more objectively and less subjectively minded. The unseen world faded more into the background, which was one reason for the decreasing interest in doctrine and the increasing interest in the social and aesthetic aspects of church activity. But the minister still taught that God required a man to act according to his conscience. And conscientious behaviour included acting according to many attitudes of economic origin. While, therefore, the religious life was a means of escape from economic and material experience, there were these connections: (1) The hardships of the economic life gave a zest for religious experience; (2) religious experiences reacted on the economic life and conduced to health, prosperity and righteous living, including a living up to economic obligations; (3) the material results of the economic life were indispensable for the support of church services and the latter seemed to be indispensable to the religious life; (4) the church enhanced the prosperity of the community and a prosperous community in turn made a prosperous church.

The farmer's attitude to education was economic. The purpose

of rural education was to give the child those rudiments that could not be given in the home and which he or she would need as a farmer or a farmer's wife; and the expense of the district school was kept as low as possible. The farmer was proud of the American public school system but his pride was due to the fact that under the difficult pioneer conditions it provided free public education for all, not in the fact that education was more than of the most meagre kind. And such it has remained because the farmer's attention has centred not on education but on taxes. The essential attitude of public education was discipline, which was a transmuted economic attitude. Discipline made education adaptive in a period when economic efficiency required constant and extreme exertion in clearing land and making it productive. However, education, like religion, had a subjective side. There was a feeling, especially among women, that education should foster culture, that, among other things, it should increase one's capacity for a spiritual interpretation of the Bible. There was also a beginning of education for prestige and the more prosperous farmers sent their boys and girls to private academies. This subjective aspect of education expanded in the second and third periods. The New York State Grange passed resolutions emphasizing the importance of a cultural education. But, after all, much of the so-called cultural education was for the purpose of winning objective evidences of superiority, as degrees, marks, prizes. In this it approached the economic emphasis on material things.

The intellectual attitudes of the farmer adapted him to his material situation. His ingenuity was born of necessity. His solitary life strengthened the tendency to act on his own ideas, not to seek advice or to discuss opinions with others. This mental narrowness was still further encouraged by his active life. Aside from occasions when he positively had to stop and think, his inclination was not to think but to act according to habit and to follow rules and formulas. When he did get interested in a new idea he did not take time really to broaden his mind but was absorbed in its practical aspects. His position as head of a family enterprise made him extremely careful to guard his authority, consequently he was averse to owning that he was mistaken. Because of the setness of his ideas and because of his position as head of an enterprise he was given to argument rather than to frank discussion. These attitudes adapted an agricultural people to its material environment, until changing conditions made the mental setness unadaptive. The prevailing attitudes shaped

the minds not only of the farming population but to a certain extent also of business and professional men.

One of the most striking series of facts for the economic interpretation is the fundamental rôle of self-restraint in rural development. This disposition was an adaptation to the requirement of constant exertion and endurance of hardship. It expressed itself, as we have seen, in several very important attitudes, particularly in thrift, in an austrere religious attitude, in an attitude for rigorous law enforcement and in an attitude for loyalty in every social relationship. Each of these fundamental attitudes in turn differentiated into several particular attitudes. Thrift differentiated into an attitude for saving money, for saving products, for frugal living, for saving time and steps. Austerity differentiated into attitudes against particular indulgences and into attitudes against classes and sects which indulged in forbidden pleasures. The attitude for rigorous law enforcement likewise made against the self-indulgence that weakened the worker, and also against the wilfulness that interfered with the peaceful pursuit of industry. The attitude for loyalty differentiated into a variety of loyal attitudes. So from this main taproot of self-restraint, due primarily to economic conditions, there ramified a complicated series of essential attitudes. When economic conditions changed, in the second period, self-restraint weakened and with it every attitude that ramified from it. Self-restraint also gave rise to a variety of ideas about life and institutions. Civilization was defined as "organized self-restraint." Conduct was conceived as determined not by an ideal of development of personality but by the ideal of self-restraint. When the attitude of self-restraint weakened, all these ideas began to lose their authority.

The importance of the economic factors runs through the entire development we are considering. The settlers' life was a struggle for subsistence. Their habits and attitudes were those that adapted them to win subsistence and to survive with a minimum of the comforts of life. Their industry, thrift, self-restraint seem to us extreme merely by comparison with our own deficiency in these traits, which, in turn, is due to the fact that we are not "so hard put to it" as they were. Hard necessity centred their attention on subsistence. The succeeding generations inherited the habits and attitudes of the first, though more comfortably situated, and there was a conflict between those who would doggedly maintain the attitudes that had made their fathers strong to survive and those who would "let down a little." But did wealth occupy a smaller place in the considerations of the

farmers grown more comfortable? If its production did its consumption had a larger place. They inherited the wealth accumulated by the previous generations. Because of improvements in means of communication they lived less isolated lives, and they did not have to work so incessantly. In their rising standard of living they imitated the business and professional classes of the villages and cities. Their essential disposition ceased to be the acquisitive and the rivalrous disposition became more conspicuous. They did not want to feel inferior to the village folks and the way to do away with this feeling was to "have things as good as village folks have." Finally, what gave the impetus to the recent great development of agricultural organization? Needless to say it was the desire of farmers to improve their economic condition.

CHAPTER XXV

OUR RURAL HERITAGE AND THE NATIONAL LIFE

OUR rural heritage has profoundly affected our national psychology. This is true of all classes of attitudes described in the preceding chapters. The pioneer conditions increased the influence of woman in the home and the community. So did the conditions of settled agricultural life and this was one of the influences that made for the emancipation of woman and for the final achievement of political equality. The rural attitude of austere self-restraint and the resulting rigorous standard of morality also have affected the national life, as seen in the legislation against various forms of vice. The vigorous attitude for the enforcement of law likewise is rural; so is our predilection for formulas and conventional phrases in our thinking; so is our keen partisanship that has thus far maintained the two party system. The widely prevalent belief in special providence and the pronounced regard for the Sabbath also savour of rural life. It is not possible here to make a comprehensive survey of the possible effects of our rural heritage on the national life. I shall confine the analysis to economic attitudes. A thorough-going analysis is impossible for this line of research is new and we have not yet developed an adequate technique for investigating the dissemination of attitudes. All we can do is to indicate similarities between rural attitudes and those of business, the professions and industry and cite facts which lead us to believe that attitudes passed from rural culture into the national life.

In considering this transmutation of rural attitudes, we must bear in mind that, in spite of the development of transportation, manufacturing and commerce and the resulting growth of urban population, a considerable part of the population of all the nations still lives under rural conditions. In the rural districts are born a considerable proportion of those who later go to the cities. They carry to the cities rural attitudes and, though they acquire city ways, the rural attitudes have a pronounced effect on business, professional and industrial life. And the business, professional and industrial classes are by no means

confined to the cities. A large number of factories are scattered through the rural districts, and there are many business and professional men. In spite of the fact that these classes feel and emphasize their differences from the farmer, their behaviour betrays rural attitudes.

Rural Attitudes in Business

The extreme individualism of American business betrays a rural influence. The early farmer, though he did not produce a great deal to sell, was, to a certain extent, a profit-seeker. He took a chance on the seasons. With the extension of railroads he produced more for the market. He got his supplies from the store, in the spring, on six months' credit. When immigration increased the supply of labour he hired farm labourers. A sense of freedom thus to bring capital and labour together on the land and take the chance of profit or loss was one of the most cherished ideals of American democracy. The farmer maintained that any man of enterprise could take up land and become an independent producer; that those who preferred to work for others did so because they lacked enterprise. Now many of the early manufacturers were also farmers or had been farmers before they became manufacturers. Like the farmer they employed only a few men; and these men, when business in the mill was slack, worked on the farms. These manufacturers maintained that any man of enterprise could save money, borrow what more he needed and start in manufacturing. His business was his by right of creation, to run as he pleased. He worked with his men and his relations with them were friendly; they did not think of challenging his right to run his business as he saw fit.

This early business attitude was carried over into modern business. It came to determine the behaviour of the head of a manufacturing plant employing twenty-five thousand men, indeed, even the behaviour of the head of a great trust employing five hundred thousand. Manufacturers now produce for a world-wide market. Their business measures affect a great variety of producers of raw materials, vast populations of consumers and an army of workmen. Yet they maintain the ancient right to run their business as they see fit with exclusive attention to the profits of stockholders. These practically have no voice in the management of a great business so that the right maintained is practically that of a little group. The business man may be cognizant

of the complexity of the social relations of his business, but his attitude is, in the last analysis, that of running the business for the profits of the comparatively few owners, not for the public welfare. It is difficult to explain this individualism except as a survival from a period of small business. The justifications given for the individualistic viewpoint imply the conditions of small business of a past age when factories were scattered through the rural districts and business men were recruited from agriculturalists.

The persistence of the individualistic viewpoint after business had developed is to be expected when we consider that business men are creatures of habit generally, as are other men. Business men accept without question the attitudes and beliefs of their vocation. Long absorption in a business results in a mesh of habits and attitudes that determine behaviour. We make a great mistake in thinking that the business man is constantly reasoning from the point of view of his own profits and changing his methods and attitudes accordingly. He accepts the profit-seeking point of view of all business and, in his personal behaviour, acts from habit and attitude. Often this is as effective as clearly thoughtout action would be but it has its limitations.[1] Such behaviour is especially ineffective when the individualistic viewpoint determines behaviour in situations that require a statesmanlike grasp of the social significance of business.

Another reason for the persistence of the attitude of small business is that people generally are in sympathy with that attitude. So public opinion supports big business in its traditional attitude. Why does the public take this attitude, in spite of the fact that it fits conditions of the past that no longer exist? The answer seems to be that the public is not cognizant of the change of conditions but reacts according to the individualistic viewpoint of the past.

Implicit in the farmer's individualistic viewpoint was the assumption that a man has a right to take advantage of another's ignorance for his own advantage. A man does not have to deal with you. A man does not have to work for you. If he chooses to deal with you, you have a right to take full advantage of any superior intelligence or impressive power that you may have. If he chooses to work for you, you have a right to take advantage of his ignorance and of your impressive power as his employer to get all the work you can out of him. The harshness of this attitude was mitigated by another, that of "live and let live." This meant considering in one's dealings that others have to live as well as oneself. So the farmer, in offering

wages, would not offer less than a labourer could live on in the customary way. This attitude passed into business and it was and is assumed that an employer has a right to use his superior intelligence and position for his own advantage in bargaining with workmen. In case of a dispute over wages he has only to prove that these are sufficient to enable workmen to live in the customary way. When workmen combine to resist this attitude and assert a right to live better and better this combination is termed "un-American." It is maintained that labour organization and a union rate of pay interfere with the sacred right of a workman to profit by his superior intelligence. But the real reason for the opposition is that the union interferes with what the employer regards as his own sacred right to profit, in bargaining with the individual labourer, by his superior position as an employer.

Business men justify the various phases of the employer's individualistic viewpoint by secondary explanations. These reflect the conditions of small business and of agriculture. These various phases of the individualistic viewpoint have furnished a basis of mental and moral resemblance between farmers and business men so that farmers have tended to sympathize with business men in their differences with workmen, rather than with the workmen.

Rural conditions accentuated the sanctity of property rights. In those early days when real and tangible property was the essential kind, the impulse to defend one's ownership and to sympathize with others in the rightful defence of their ownership was very keen. This habit of mind [2] passed on into the culture of succeeding generations and was applied indiscriminately to all forms of property, which were defended with all the tenacity with which the farmer supported his right to a tree on the boundary line. Much property to-day is of such a kind as hardly justifies this unreflective, unqualified support of property rights. Monopolies charge exorbitant rates and thus increase earning power and then boards of directors increase the capitalization based on these earnings acquired at the expense of the public. These stock certificates are felt to have all the sanctity of other property. It is because the public reacts according to its traditional attitude to property, instead of analysing the particular situation.

The farmer had a good deal of pride in his products and this attitude characterized also the artisans of the rural community and the early manufacturers. Later, profits rather than quality of product became the sign of achievement and there developed among business men a

tendency to cheapen products whenever this would increase profits.

Some of the attitudes of the business man in his treatment of his employés resemble rural attitudes and, at the same time, are so contrary to the real interests of the business man himself as to suggest the effect of the rural heritage. For instance, in the management of workmen, employers have assumed that men use initiative as a matter of course. Generally there has been little or no reason for such an assumption.[3] Men work mechanically and display little initiative. Now the early farmer was a man of initiative and expected his men to show the same trait, and often they did. So it was in the early small factory. Possibly it was in this way that the attitude came to pervade modern industry of expecting intelligent initiative on the part of workmen. Manufacturers assumed that workmen needed little instruction,[4] that their initiative could be relied on, in spite of the fact that this assumption was very evidently contrary to fact, except in the case of skilled workmen and workmen of extraordinary energy who reached positions of direction and supervision. The practice of giving workmen detailed directions in their work did not come until the rise of scientific management.

Rural Attitudes in Trade

Farmers' sons became storekeepers in the villages and cities. In their merchandising they followed rural attitudes. For instance, like the farmer, they despised the "tricks of the trader." As an instance of this, when an increase in tariff duties raised the price of goods, there were merchants who would not raise the price of their stock on hand,—not until they began to sell the higher priced goods. This was not due to competition or to fear of public disapproval for the customer did not know what the merchant paid for his goods. It was due to the rural aversion to taking advantage of some subterfuge in order to make money. Later, when the race for wealth became more intense, the merchants were inclined to abandon rural attitudes that interfered with money-making.

Rural Attitudes in the Professions

The farmer prided himself on his energy and skill in farming. The artisan, also, was proud of his craft knowledge and skill. The rural doctor and lawyer likewise were proud of their ability and this attitude

of pride in personal power, as distinguished from mere income, passed into the professions generally. Professional men especially have prided themselves on their knowledge and skill. This has always been so and is due partly to the difference between the work of professional and business men.[5] But it is due also to the effect of the rural attitude. In cities where professional men serve a large and more or less floating population, pride in skill has somewhat diminished and professional achievements are more and more measured according to a money standard.[6] There is still pride in skill but there is also more pride in mere income than formally. This attitude was not entirely lacking in the rural community. The farmer was jealous of a neighbour who received a higher price for his products than he did, because this implied that the higher priced products were superior. But a mere money standard never prevailed in the rural parts as it does in cities. The emphasis was on personal worth, not on mere income.

Rural Attitudes in Industry

The farmer was a manual workman and among workmen to-day one may see some of the attitudes that characterized the early farmer. Factory workmen were recruited from the rural districts and took with them their rural habits, including the long work day and the rural individualism. Workmen are, like the farmer, self-centred. Until trained in the principles of unionism a workman claims the right to work for whom he sees fit, for whatever wage, whatever length of day and under whatever conditions he pleases. But as the farmer is finding this individualism unsuited to the conditions of modern industry so is the workman.

Among the individualistic habits of workmen is that of rivalry in work. The farmer enjoyed seeing his boys rivalling one another in work because this meant a large output. This benefited the boys, who inherited the wealth accumulated by the father. Boys carried this habit of rivalry into work for employers. Employers benefited by this rivalry because it increased output. Workmen did not benefit but, in many cases, were injured physically and economically. Individual rivalry was unsuited to machine industry in which the employer may instigate emulation among masses of workmen for his own profit. Hence one of the policies of organized labour became that of limiting output.

Another individualistic habit in which workmen resemble farmers

is stolid endurance. Go into a foundry and remark on the hard work of the men and the foreman will respond, "Oh, they can stand it. They're used to it." He is but echoing the attitude of the workmen themselves. Their inclination is to hide weariness and stand up under their load. This attitude was wholesome enough when it animated the farmer who owned his own instruments of production and could determine his load and stop when he pleased. But it is contrary to the welfare of factory workmen when it causes them to endure without complaint injurious working conditions that might be improved. Workmen often are loath to support reforms on their own behalf because they foolishly feel that the demand for improved conditions would be a confession of personal weakness. But they are finding this attitude unsuited to the conditions of modern industry and are inclining toward organization as a means of self-protection.

Another attitude that characterizes both farmers and workmen is a sense of the inexorable nature of things to which man must submit. Among the early farmers this attitude was particularly directed toward physical nature. In recent years, among farmers and workmen alike, it has been directed toward the economic system, for the rise of the complex system of modern industry has thrown a mystery over the distributive process for farmers and workmen alike.[7] There are two types of reaction to this situation. The more intelligent farmers look to their co-operative organization and the more intelligent workmen to their labour organization to tell them what prices or wages they may in justice expect, and to teach them to understand the industrial system, in so far as it affects their interests. But the great mass of farmers and workmen are unorganized and maintain toward the processes of the industrial system the traditional attitude of resignation to the inevitable.

This attitude becomes evident in connection with recurring business depressions. Farmers and workmen do not understand the processes of the business cycle. To them a depression is something mysterious, unavoidable, terrible in its effect on their lives but something that must be borne with resignation. The tendency of a depression to be widespread, to come gradually, to be preceded by rumours of the shutting down of this factory and that, adds to the feeling that it was inevitable, that no human agencies were particularly to blame, that everybody is involved and all are suffering together and therefore no one should feel aggrieved. Obviously this attitude of farmers and work-

men prevents their inquiring into the causes of business cycles and the possibility of stabilizing business.

Farmers and artisans once believed in luck and in supernatural influences on their work.[8] This passed to factory workmen. But the development of machine industry in which the workman merely participates in mechanical operations has tended to eliminate this attitude. However, it has persisted in relations with the industrial system. Farmers often ascribe a rise in farm prices, and workmen sometimes ascribe a rise in wages to luck or special providence.

The influence of rural attitudes on the behaviour of factory workmen has been noted by students of European peasant life. For instance, Thomas and Znaniecki explain at length the interest of the Polish peasant in the process rather than the results of work and add: "When hired work begins to develop, there gradually enters a new motive—that of wages. But the essential attitude is not changed. It is for the process not for the results of work that . . . the hired labourer, even the factory workman, considers himself to be paid." [9]

The principal objection to the theory of the rural heritage as an important determinant of national psychology is that attitudes similar to rural in business, trade, the professions and industry may not be an inheritance at all but may be due to similar conditions in those occupations which developed similar attitudes. It is true that individualism naturally develops wherever men start a venture in wealth getting, whether it is among people who live by hunting and fishing,[10] or farmers who own and till the soil, or factory owners. But would the individualism of American business and industry have been as extreme as it has been without the influence of the traditional rural individualism? Some of the business and industrial attitudes above described were even contrary to the interests of business men and workmen. Instinct, it may be said, explains this. As farmer boys rivalled one another whenever they got together in the woodlot or the field, so did workmen in the factory, though it was contrary to their interests. But does instinct really explain such cases? A careful study of the behaviour of employers and workmen will convince one, I think, that, while instinct may explain some behaviour and while some is to be explained as an intelligent adaptation to existing conditions, a considerable part can only be explained as due to underlying attitudes that were acquired, in the first instance, from the rural heritage. By the rural heritage we mean that derived from the early rural community, not necessarily from farmers. The entire community was affected by its

isolation, though not all were farmers. However, the attitudes of farmers predominantly determined the social attitudes of the rural community.

The theory of the rural heritage is an hypothesis that opens up a wide field of social-psychological research. Of course every school boy is familiar with the idea that the principles of our national life were handed down by our forefathers. But just what is meant by principles and just who the forefathers were is not definitely stated. From the point of view of rural psychology the question is, in how far were the principles determined by the attitudes and beliefs of the rural community as interpreted and expressed by political leaders and applied to particular situations that confronted the nation? Did not the forefathers include not only the leaders who attained national recognition but also the citizens in every community who exemplified the prevailing attitudes and beliefs? The forefathers tended to look on the national heritage as something to be preserved and handed down from generation to generation. But, as we shall see in *The Expansion of Rural Life,* that which the nation received from its predominantly rural population was not something that could be kept unchanged, in spite of the sanctity thrown about it by the well-meaning guardians of American ideals. Conditions changed, and change in the rural heritage was inevitable. Individualism became unprofitable and had to give way. In this process of change, other vocations have influenced the farmer, as well as the farmer other vocations. The co-operative attitude, which promises to transform rural life developed in other vocations before farming. Rural leaders saw business men organizing to raise prices and increase their profits; saw workingmen organizing to raise their wages. They used these arguments with the rank and file of still individualistic farmers. The rural population gave the nation its extreme individualism but the modifications of this attitude were initiated elsewhere and these developments are reacting on rural organization.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

[1] Williams, The Foundations of Social Science, 47–48; Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, Bk. III.

[2] The best introduction to this interpretation of American society is Dr. Charles A. Beard's epoch-making books, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* and *Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy.* See also his brilliant little book, *The Economic Basis of Politics.*

CHAPTER I

[1] Fourteenth Census Reports, V: Ch. XIV.

[2] The sources of these statistics are as follows: For England and Wales, Preliminary Census Report, England and Wales, 1921, pp. 5, 6; Canada Yearbook, 1921, p. 115; Statesman's Yearbook, 1923. For Germany, Statistisches Reichamt, Oct. 3, 1921–22; Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsches Reich, 1921–22, p. 14. For France, The French Yearbook, 1919, p. 174; Report on Economic Conditions in France, March, 1923, p. 103. For Poland, Annuaire Statistique de la Republique Polonaise, 1920–1921; Statesman's Yearbook, 1923. For Sweden, Sverige's Statistik Arsbok, 1923, p. 5. For Denmark, Danmark's Statistik Aarbog, 1923, p. 1. For Russia, Russian Annuaire Statistique, 1918–20, Tome VIII, Copy 1, p. 2. For Japan and India, Sherwood Eddy, The New World of Labor, 40, 77.

[3] Butterfield, Chapters in Rural Progress, 201.

[4] Bryce, The American Commonwealth, II: 293.

[5] In most of the countries of continental Europe, up to the time of the World War, the farm tenant, no matter how thrifty he was, had little chance of becoming a farm owner. The peasant held his farm on a long lease. Except in Russia this condition was not greatly changed by the war. For an intimate view of the life of the peasant in France see Guillaumin, *The Life of a Simple Man* and Roupnel, *Nono: Love and the Soil.* For a picture of the peasants of Lithuania see Kobrin, *A Lithuanian Village;* of the peasants of Russia, Poole, *The Village: Russian Impressions;* of the Scandinavian farmer, Hamsun, *The Growth of the Soil;* of the English peasant, Heath, *British Rural Life and Labor* and Rowntree, *How the Laborer Lives;* of the Rumanian peasant, Slavici, *Die Rumänen;* of the Polish peasant, Thomas and Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America.*

[6] In Europe they are smaller than in the United States and in Japan and China are excessively small. (Clarke, Japan at First Hand, 16; Nitobé, The Japanese Nation, 212; Ross, The Changing Chinese, 301–302.)

[7] Eddy, The New World of Labor, Chs. I–III.

[8] Thomas and Znaniecki, The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, I: 156, 189–204.

[9] Sims, A Hoosier Village, Columbia University Studies, Vol. XLVI, No. 4, Chs. V–VI.

[10] The building of railroads was going on at the same time in the middle west and was working the same change there. (Thompson and Warber, Social and

Economic Survey of a Rural Township in Southern Minnesota, Univ. of Minn., 16, 21.)

[11] Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., I: 189.

[12] Ibid. I: 156.

CHAPTER II

[1] Williams, The Foundations of Social Science, 446.

[2] Ibid. 435.

[3] For a list of the village weeklies of New York State see American Newspaper Annual and Directory, 1924, 672–762.

[4] Atwood, The Country Newspaper, 2; Atwood, The Country Weekly in New York State. Cornell Reading Course for the Farm, Lesson 155, pp. 283, 288, 316–317.

CHAPTER III

[1] For a concise account of the physical geography of New York see Fippin, Rural New York, Ch. I.

[2] Fippin, Rural New York, 1921; Turner, The Holland Purchase of Western New York, 1849; Eastman, History of the State of New York, 1830; Mather and Brockett, A Geographical History of the State of New York, 1849.

[3] Fippin, op. cit., 56–63.

[4] Fippin, op. cit., 65–69; Farrand, The Basis of American History, 27–32; Eastman, History of New York, 323–324, 359–363; Mather and Brockett, Geographical History of New York, 95–99.

[5] Mather and Brockett, op. cit., 119.

[6] In Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century the peasants lived likewise in isolated villages. Every peasant farm produced almost exclusively for itself, only to the most limited extent for exchange. (Von Hupka, Ueber die Entwicklung der westgalizischen Dortzustände, 388 ff.) In India, also, the rural village was an isolated community until after 1900. The recent changes in the peasant life of India are due to the passing of this isolation. (Mann, Land and Labor in a Deccan Village, 150–155; Mann and Kanitkar, Land and Labor in a Deccan Village, Study No. 2, 157–168.)

[7] Our typical town, in 1845, had the following industries: four gristmills, four sawmills, one brick and tile factory, one tannery, two distilleries, one potash works, one malt factory, one woollen factory, two organ factories, one shoe factory, one foundry, three smelting furnaces, two machine shops. In 1875, some of these had disappeared but factories of other kinds had appeared. In 1900, there were three gristmills, one sawmill, one brick and tile factory, one foundry, one creamery, one milk station. In 1924, there was one knitting mill, one sawmill, one print shop, one foundry, one canning factory, one milk station. Thus the small factories had largely disappeared.

In 1845 artisans were found in every rural neighbourhood of our typical town. In 1900 there were artisans in only one of the eleven rural neighbourhoods.

[8] In our typical town the settlers of each neighbourhood were more intimately related to each other than to the families of other neighbourhoods. Statistics gathered by an old resident give the relationship of most of the early families of eight of the twelve neighbourhoods and in all of these eight, one-half or more of the families whose relationship was known were related to some other family in the neighbourhood.

[9] Through proximity previous to immigration as well as through kinship the

settlers of each neighbourhood of our typical town were more intimate with each other than with other neighbourhoods. We have information as to place of emigration of most of the families of ten of the twelve neighbourhoods and in all these neighbourhoods most of the families came from the same county in New England, and, in some cases, from the same village or city as another family of the neighbourhood.

[10] Sanderson and Thompson, The Social Areas of Otsego County, Agric. Exp. Station of Cornell Univ., Bulletin 422, 26–27. The same is true in western states. See Kolb, Rural Primary Groups, Bulletin 51 of Agric. Exp. Station of Wisconsin.

[11] Sanderson and Thompson, op. cit., 28.

[12] At first churches were built in the open country at points that were convenient for the members. As the villages grew, the tendency was to build churches in the villages and the country churches were closed. Churches must be at central points in order to enlist as large a number of people as possible in their support. In our typical town a Congregational church with its meeting house at The Center was founded in 1796, and a Baptist church with its meeting house at Blankville in 1801. These were the only two churches in the town until 1823 when, as a result of a split in the Congregational Church, a Presbyterian church was founded with its meeting house at Blankville. The Congregational was exclusively a church of the rural neighbourhoods, the Presbyterian was made up largely of Blankville members, while the membership of the Baptist was about evenly divided between the rural neighbourhoods and Blankville. In 1835 a Methodist Episcopal church was founded and it had its meeting house at Blankwell in 1847–1857, after that at Blankville. Before the Civil War all the churches of the town had become located in Blankville. In addition to those named there was an Episcopal church, founded in 1840, a Roman Catholic, founded in 1850, and a Welsh Congregational, founded in 1852. All the above churches were still in existence in 1923. As to the distribution of this church membership, at first the families of a neighbourhood tended largely or wholly to belong to the same church. But by 1845, as a result of the shifting of population and of new families coming in, in only two of the twelve neighbourhoods did all the church-going families attend the same church. Of course if neighbours belonged to the same church they had that much more in common. On the other hand the factional quarrels in a church often divided neighbours, in which case neighbours were on more friendly terms if they belonged to different churches.

CHAPTER IV

[1] Fippin, Rural New York, 41–55.

[2] Calhoun, A Social History of the American Family, I: 183.

[3] Fippin, op. cit., 50–54.

[4] Professor Sims noted in Indiana a tendency to impulsive behaviour and emotional religion among people in the less fertile agricultural sections. (Sims, A Hoosier Village, 141–143.)

[5] Flint, Recollections of the Past Ten Years (1826), 200–203; Trollope, North America, I: 45; Turner, The Significance of the Frontier in American History, Proceed. of Forty-first Annual Meeting of State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Reprint, 11–13; Turner, The Rise of the New West, 85–92.

[6] Thompson and Warber, Social and Economic Survey of a Rural Township in Southern Minnesota, Studies in Economics, No. 1, University of Minnesota, 4.

[7] Ibid. 4.

[8] Williams, The Foundations of Social Science, 99.

CHAPTER V

[1] Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, 87, 92.
[2] Ibid. 89.
[3] Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., I: 174.
[4] Williams, op. cit., Chs. V–XI.
[5] Ibid. 53–55.
[6] Darwin, Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, 73, 83.
[7] The occurrence of unfavourable weather conditions is a risk that must be recognized by successful farmers. It is said that in case of unfavourable conditions the occurrence of which follows the "normal law of frequency" as, for instance, the occurrence of frosts, the risk may be determined with a fair degree of accuracy and farmers can profit by these forecasts of experts. (Reed and Tolly, Weather as a Business Risk in Farming, Monthly Weather Review, Vol. 44, p. 354.)
[8] Stuart, The Potato, 21, 80.
[9] For a description of the processes by which the Weather Bureau arrives at its predictions see Smith, Speaking of the Weather, Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture, 1920, 181–202. He shows that the Bureau gives predictions as to the temperature, the direction of the wind, the precipitation—whether fair, cloudy or rain,—as to danger from storms, floods, early or late frosts. These predictions enable farmers to take precautions to avoid losses that would otherwise be enormous.
[10] Humphreys, Some Useful Weather Proverbs, Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture, 1912, 373–382; Garriott, Weather Folk-Lore and Local Weather Signs, U. S. Weather Bureau, Bulletin 33, 5–47; Cathrop, The Charm of Gardens, Ch. X.
[11] In this connection it is interesting that the Hebrew Sabbath, from which our Sunday developed, was originally a moon festival that came at the time of the new moon and the full moon and, eventually at other phases of the moon, that is, about every seven days. Changes in the moon, particularly the appearance of the new moon and the rise of the full moon, caused great interest and some apprehension. The custom of observing the Sabbath by abstinence from work was a result of apprehension. It was felt to be best to be quiet and not work at those critical times. (Webster, Rest Days, 248–253.) Easter also is related to the moon in that it comes after the first full moon following the vernal equinox. Among the ancients the festival of the full moon was a solemn occasion as marking the transition to the waning moon. (Jastrow, The Civilizations of Babylonia and Assyria, 204, 279.)

CHAPTER VI

[1] Calhoun, op. cit., I: Chs. III–IX.
[2] Ibid. I: 180–183.
[3] Ibid. I: 174.
[4] Ibid. I: 183.
[5] Ibid. I: 37–39.
[6] Ibid. I: 39–40.
[7] Ibid. I: 41.
[8] Ibid. I: 41.
[9] Ibid. I: 51.
[10] Ibid. I: 56–57.
[11] Ibid. I: 54–55.
[12] Ibid. I: 52, 67–78.
[13] Ibid. I: 55.

[14] Ibid. I: 71.
[15] Ibid. I: 78.
[16] Ibid. I: 79.
[17] Ibid. I: 80.

CHAPTER VII

[1] "Nearly all of New York State was originally heavily timbered. . . . Hardwood made up nearly all of the tree flora. . . . There were a few prairie tracts mostly in river bottoms. At Mt. Morris, in the Genesee River flats, was a prairie of 6,000 acres. . . . On Long Island around Hempstead and Jamaica was a large prairie tract on well drained soil. . . ." (Fippin, Rural New York, 74.) The Indians had large farms on these prairie stretches. They also cleared and cultivated fields adjacent to their villages. (Ibid. 59.)

[2] Calhoun, A Social History of the American Family, II: 162.
[3] Ibid. II: 161.
[4] See sketches of Robert Glover and Calvin Griffiths, pioneers of Iowa, by John Somerville, a pioneer with those men, in the Manson Journal, June 14, and July 5, 1923.
[5] Wilson, The Evolution of the Country Community, Ch. I.
[6] Turner, The Holland Purchase of Western New York, 325–645.
[7] Calhoun, op. cit., II: 80.
[8] Roberts, Autobiography of a Farm Boy, 24.
[9] This is true in the West, also. (Lindquist, What Farm Women are Thinking, University of Minnesota, Agric. Ext. Div., Special Bulletin, No. 71, 11.)
[10] In Europe also the woman has been valued according to her capacity for work. (Kobrin, A Lithuanian Village, 151.)

CHAPTER VIII

[1] This was the custom throughout rural America. (Calhoun, A Social History of the American Family, II: Ch. I.)
[2] The Roman Catholic Church through the confessional has exerted an immense influence in preventing any practice that had to do with limiting the number of children. (Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., IV: 104–106.)
[3] Large families continue the rule in many rural parts of the country to-day. (Phelan, Readings in Rural Sociology, 319.)
[4] Calhoun, op. cit., II: 15.
[5] Ibid. II: 107.
[6] This is true in Europe to this day. (Von Hupka, Ueber die Entwicklung der westgalizischen Dorfzustände, 368–71.)
[7] Calhoun, op. cit., II: 150.
[8] Ibid. I: 92–95.
[9] Ibid. II: 95.
[10] Ibid. II: 80; Westermarck, The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas, I: 654–662; Sumner, Folkways, 357–372.
[11] Calhoun, op. cit., II: 106–107.
[12] Cather, One of Ours, 193.
[13] Calhoun, op. cit., II; 119–120; Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, 278.
[14] Calhoun, op. cit., II: 87.
[15] Ibid. II: 11–12.
[16] This is true in European nations to-day. (Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., I: 93.)
[17] Calhoun, op. cit., II: 81.

[18] Ibid. II: 82.
[19] Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, Ch. XVIII.

CHAPTER IX

[1] Calhoun, op. cit., I: Ch. VI.
[2] Ibid. I: 47.
[3] Ibid. I: 47.
[4] Ibid. I: 153.
[5] Simkhowitsch, Die Feldgemeinschaft in Russland, 364.
[6] Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., IV: 21–22.
[7] Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, 366.
[8] Calhoun, op. cit., II: 53.
[9] Ibid. II: 52.
[10] Ibid. II: 131.
[11] In European nations where the influence of the older generations over the young couple is stronger than in rural America, this attitude of the woman has been an important factor in family individuation. (Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., I: 97–98.)
[12] This is characteristic of European agricultural communities to-day. (Krauss, Sitte und Brauch der Südslaven, 103.)
[13] This tendency is seen in European rural communities. (Von Hupka, Ueber die Entwicklung der westgalizischen Dorfzustände, 388 f.)
[14] In European nations to-day the children have this attitude toward a rebellious one among them. (Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., I: 91.)
[15] Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., II: 183.
[16] Ibid. II: 183.
[17] Ibid. II: 185.
[18] Ibid. I: 101.
[19] Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, Ch. XX.
[20] This development is seen also in European nations. (Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., I: 105; IV: Pt. I, Chs. II–V, Pt. II, Chs. III–VI.)

CHAPTER XI

[1] Calhoun, op. cit., I: 46.
[2] Calhoun, op. cit., I: 281.
[3] Mavor, Economic History of Russia, II: 259.
[4] Ibid. II: 258.
[5] Ibid. II: 271.
[6] Roberts, The Autobiography of a Farm Boy, 40–45.
[7] The peasants of Europe seem to be a good deal lacking in generous impulses due, probably, to the suppression of these because of their oppression by landlords. (Slavici, Die Rumänen, 140–150.)

CHAPTER XII

[1] Fippin, Rural New York, 74–76.
[2] Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, 230–238.
[3] Reed, Training for the Public Profession of the Law, 83–85.

CHAPTER XIII

[1] Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, 90–91.
[2] Calhoun, op. cit., II: 222.

CHAPTER XIV

[1] Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, 31, 64.

CHAPTER XV

[1] European rural populations differ in this respect. The Russian peasants are more mystical and less practical in religion than the Polish peasants. (Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., I: 287; IV: 154.)

[2] People who are ecstatically religious are not apt to be successful farmers. They are apt to be found on the poorer farms. Being on poor farms in turn encourages people to leave their work for religious exercises whenever fancy strikes them, for they have not the incentive to persistent work that a man has who possesses a fine farm. Not only adverse physical conditions but also unfavourable social conditions of the farmer, as the oppression of tenants and labourers by a landlord class, encourages strange religious ideas and practices. (Stern, Geschichte der offentlichen Sittlichkeit in Russland, I: 248.) It encourages also a fatalistic religion. (Bernhard, Die Polenfrage, 556–57; Hupka, Ueber die Entwicklung der westgalizischen Dortzustände, 56 f., 275 f.)

[3] In all nations was, and still is found this nervousness about the masses. In Russia, even before the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, when some landlords were building factories on their estates and taking their serfs from the rural villages to live around the factories, the government and the landowners were nervous about this grouping of masses of peasants in close quarters where they might stir up one another. For this reason the landowners frowned on the growth of factory industry in Russia and even opposed the building of railways because they "only encourage frequent and unnecessary travelling, and in this way increase the instability of the spirit of our epoch." (Mavor, An Economic History of Russia, I: 561.) The rise and development of democratic government only increased this nervousness in the nations of Europe and we find it among the landowners in "free America" where, because the masses had the vote, religion was particularly relied on to keep the masses down. In Europe and in the United States the Roman Catholic Church most effectively exercised this function, both because it was the church to which the most feared masses belonged and because the clergy required unthinking submission to dogma, which attitude was felt to conduce to "law and order." So the Protestant farmer both disliked the Catholic Church and relied on it to keep the masses down.

[4] Roberts, op. cit., 74–75.

[5] Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., I: 300–301.

CHAPTER XVII

[1] In other parts of the world, also, this seems to have been the relation of the schoolmaster to the community. (Matthai, Village Government in British India, 49.)

CHAPTER XVIII

[1] For instance, Mr. Stuart, horticulturalist of the Bureau of Plant Industry of the U. S. Department of Agriculture writes me that of all the men in the United States named by him in his book, *The Potato,* as instrumental in improving the varieties of potatoes, all but two were farmers.

[2] Trowbridge, My Own Story, Ch. I.

[3] Bernard, A Theory of Rural Attitudes, Amer. Jour. Sociol., XXII: 634.

[4] The tendency to feel wronged, to seek vengeance and to litigate is pronounced in European rural populations. (Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., IV: 19.)

CHAPTER XIX

[1] Williams, The Foundations of Social Science, 117.
[2] Roberts, The Autobiography of a Farm Boy, 23.
[3] Mavor, An Economic History of Russia, II: 261.
[4] Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., II: 63.
[5] Wallace, Russia, 464.

CHAPTER XX

[1] Roberts, The Autobiography of a Farm Boy, 35.

CHAPTER XXIII

[1] Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., III: 56.
[2] Leaders in rural progress in Europe aim to sanction new progressive attitudes by identifying them with some attractive political purpose or religious idea. (Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., IV: 268, 334.)
[3] Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, 15.
[4] Calhoun, op. cit., III: 132.
[5] Ibid. II: 55–63.
[6] Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, Ch. XIV.
[7] The Journal of John Woolman, 53.
[8] This is true in Europe as well as in the United States. For instance, in Poland the Catholic priest is a very egoistic person and finds egoistic attitudes not uncongenial. "The standard of living of the priest is on the average much higher than that of a peasant-farmer. Moreover, many priests, particularly those of peasant origin, consider their profession a career made for the benefit of their families and exploit their flock rather ruthlessly. As long as the prestige of the priest remains unchallenged the peasants interpret his economic demands as necessarily resulting from his position, and the honour of the parish community seems to require that its priest be at least as well-to-do as other priests, just as it requires a church building of a certain size and aesthetic perfection. But, of course, along with this standard there always existed the opposite standard of simplicity and disinterestedness, which some of the clergy applied in their behaviour. This standard has been lately more and more popularized by the democratic propaganda," and there has developed among the clergy a movement to make the behaviour of the priests conform to the new popular requirements. (Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., IV: 155–156.)

CHAPTER XXV

[1] Williams, Principles of Social Psychology, 120.
[2] Hamilton and May, The Control of Wages, 41.
[3] Taylor, Principles of Scientific Management, 33–35.
[4] Ibid. Ch. II. Williams, op. cit., 169 n.
[5] Williams, op. cit., Ch. XV.
[6] Ibid. 234–235.
[7] Hamilton and May, op. cit., 14–15.
[8] Williams, op. cit., 87, 92.
[9] Thomas and Znaniecki, op. cit., I: 174.
[10] Goldenweiser, Early Civilization, 409–410.

INDEX

Acquisitiveness, 7, 31, 81, 196-197, 201-202, 204, 207-208, 214-215, 227.
Aesthetic attitudes, 149, 150, 172-173, 206, 218, 224.
Agricultural work, 5, 6, 32, 36-38, 42, 50-52, 54, 82-84, 86-89, 159-161, 166, 192-194, 219, 221.
Argumentation, 148-149, 166-168.
Assertiveness, 7, 122, 166, 201-208.
Attitudes, Introduction, 1; social a., 9, 10; nature of, 10, 32, 199-200, 213-214.

Beliefs, 9, 10, 139.
Business attitude, compared with farmer's, 37, 41, 44-45, 97, 229-230.

Climate, effect of, on attitudes, 25, 26.
Competition, 98.
Co-operation, 4, 5, 7, 94-97.
Courage, 94.
Custom, adherence to, 3, 6, 7, 51, 164, Ch. XXI, 221, 222; departure from, 4, 8, 28-31; basis of legal interpretation, 74.

Doctor, attitudes of, 105-108, 232.
Domination, 47-48, 52-53, 56, 58, 60-67, 69, 71, 95, 186, 203, 214.

Economic attitudes, Ch. XI, 136, 228.
Economic interpretation, Introduction, 3, 4, Ch. XXIV.
Education, 36, 66, Ch. XVII, 224.
Equality, 111-112, 174, 203, 228.

Familiarity, sense of, 71, 162.
Family attitudes, Chs. VI-IX, 135-136.
Family solidarity, 48-49, 72, 78-80.
Fearfulness, 130, 135, 196.
Fertility, effect of, on attitudes, 26; maintenance of, 28.
Formulas, 33, 42-44, 168-169, 175-176, 188.
Freedom of speech, 170.

Games, 35, 115-116.
Generosity, 95, 204.
Gossip, 117-118.

History, material of, Introduction, 1, 2; interpretation of, 2.
Honesty, 98, 211.
Honor, 99.
Humor, Ch. XIV, 203.

Indecision, 32, 38-39.
Independence, 32, 38, 70, 90, 131, 162, 169, 192, 205, 206, 221.
Individualism, 4, 5, 7, 51, 54-55, 57, 59, 60, 74-77, 98, 101, 229-231, 233, 236.
Industry, 35-38, 52-53, 87-88.
Inheritance, 69.
Intellectual attitudes, 7, 8, 10, 38-40, 156; Ch. XVIII, 188-189, 225.
Isolation, 32, 38, 56, 66, 70-71, 74, 78, 119, 161-163, 192-193, 197, 200, 221, 235.

Law, as related to the family, 59; respect for, 72, 174-177; function of, 178-184, 228.
Lawyer, attitudes of, 108-109, 232.
Leadership, Introduction, 3, 185-187, 204.
Liberty, 84, 85, 174.
Loyalty, 71, 79, 143, 186-187, 191, 195, 211-212.

Manufacturer, attitudes of, 103-104.
Moon, attitudes to, 42-44.
Mystery, sense of, 42, 128-130.

Optimism, 41.
Orthodoxy, 146-147.

Partisanship, 185-191, 204, 228.
Patriotism, 191, 204.
Persistence, 87.
Political attitudes, 36-37, 68, Ch. XX.
Progress, Introduction, 3, 213.
Property rights, 89, 93, 231.
Public opinion, Introduction, 1.
Pugnacity, 92-93.

Religion, 36, 40, 47, 53, 56-57, 59, 66-67, 72, 123, Chs. XV-XVI, 204, 216-220, 223-224.
Reserve, 32, 170-171.
Resignation, 27, 33, 137-138, 234.

Resistfulness, 205-206.
Risk, 34, 40.
Rivalry, Introduction, 2, pp. 7, 8, 29, 75-76, 124-127, 196-197, 227, 233-235.
Rural community, nature of, 12, 13, 17, 18, Ch. III, 72.
Rural development, Introduction, 1; theory of, 3-8.
Rural neighborhood, 21-24, 100-101.
Rural newspaper, 14, 15.
Rural population, 1.
Rural social psychology, methods of, Introduction, 1, 2, Ch. II, 32; importance of, Introduction, 4, 5, pp. 1, 2; sources of, 2, 13-16; relation of, to urban psychology, 2, 11, 32.
Rural survey, 13.

Scientific attitude, compared with farmer's a., 37-38.
Sectarianism, 141-143, 194-195, 204.
Self-reliance, 71, 85.
Self-restraint, 25, 26, 47, 53, 54, 81, 88-91, 175, 195-196, 211-213, 226.
Sexual morality, 47, 57-58, 61.
Sincerity, 99.
Social classes, 111-115.
Social conflict, Ch. XXIII.
Social consciousness, Ch. XXIII.
Society and the individual, 9-11, Ch. XXII.
Speculation, 30.
Storekeeper, attitudes of, 104-105, 232.
Sympathy, 7, 8, 119-122, 202, 203, 206, 208, 214-220, 222, 223.

Thrift, 31, 90-92.
Topography, psychological effect of, 26-28, 30-31.
Transmutation of attitudes, 41, 72-73, 97, 228.
Truthfulness, 99.

Uncertainty, 33-36, 38-39, 42, 192.

Weather, psychological effects of, Ch. V, 135, 162, 192-193, 221, 222.

DATE DUE

WITHDRAWN FROM
OHIO NORTHERN
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

GAYLORD PRINTED IN U.S.A

HETERICK MEMORIAL LIBRARY
323.3 W72 onuu
Williams, James Mic/Our rural heritage;
3 5111 00142 4583

323.3
WT2

T5-AVN-211